

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

- - - - -

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- - - - -

SCOPING MEETING

- - - - -

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1999

- - - - -

The meeting was held in the Conference Center,
Best Western Tower Inn, 151 George Washington Way,
Richland, Washington, at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

JIM PARHAM, Facilitator

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE Headquarters)

COLETTE BROWN, PEIS Project Manager,
Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology
SHANE JOHNSON, Program Manager
RAJ SHARMA, NEPA Compliance Officer
CHRIS KARIS

U.S. Department of Energy (Richland, WA, Operations)

DOUG CHAPIN
AL FARABEE
GAIL McCLURE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Facilitator:	Jim Parham	
Opening Statement:	Colette Brown	
Presentation:	Colette Brown	
Question and Answer Session:		p. 15
Formal Comment Session:		
U.S. Senator Slade Gorton		p. 22
U.S. Representative Doc Hastings (WA)		p. 26
State Representative Shirley Hankins (WA)		p. 30
State Senator Patricia S. Hale (WA)		p. 32
Larry Halder, Mayor, Richland, WA		p. 32
Charles Kilbury, Mayor, Pasco, WA		p. 36
James R. Beaver, Mayor, Kennewick, WA		p. 38
Gerald R. Greenfield		p. 40
Mayor Pro Tem, Richland, WA		
Hal Lindberg		p. 41
Port of Benton Commission (WA)		
Jerry A. Peltier		p. 43
Mayor, West Richland, WA		
Claude Oliver		p. 45
Board of Benton County		
Commissioners (WA)		
Ken Dobbin		p. 46
Council Member, West Richland, WA		
Norm Englehart		p. 50
Commissioner, Port of Kennewick (WA)		
Laurel Piippo		p. 52
Marjorie Maris Peterson		p. 56
John Boland		p. 59
Marlene Oliver		p. 63
National Association of Cancer Patients		
Gerry Pollet		p. 69
Heart of America Northwest		
George Jacobson		p. 76
Bob Anderson		p. 79
Benton County (WA)		
Democratic Central Committee		
Mark Beck		p. 81
Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington		
Pamela Brown		p. 85
Hanford Communities		
Bob Schenter		p. 88
Nuclear Medicine Research Council		
Cindy Meyer		p. 92
Robert Franco		p. 94
Benton/Franklin County		

Medical Society

Table of Contents (Continued):

Formal Comment Session:

Susan Babilon	p. 95
Norm Buske	p. 98
Nuclear Weapons-Free America	
Robert Beach	p. 101
Dave Watrous	p. 106
Columbia River Basin Chapter, American Society for Metals International	
Edward Siciliano	p. 112
Dave Johnson	p. 116
Rhean Souders	p. 120
George Ruge	p. 122
Sol Guttenberg	p. 124
Gai Oglesbee	p. 128
Erin Gajarszki	p. 133
Walt Apley	p. 135
Bruce Klos	p. 136
James Paglieri	p. 140
Michael Contini	p. 144
Wayne Baker	p. 148
Siemens Power Corporation	
Tom Burke	p. 150
Bill Martin	p. 153
Tri-City Industrial Development Council	
Sheryl I. Paglieri	p. 155
Dick Hammond	p. 157
Robert Burke	p. 161
Melody Jenke	p. 163
Marlene Oliver	p. 164
Dick Ohava	p. 165

Exhibits:

- Exhibit No. 1 - Written comments of
U.S. Senator Slade Gorton
- Exhibit No. 2 - Written comments of
U.S. Representative Doc Hastings
- Exhibit No. 3 - Written comments of
State Representative
Shirley Hankins (WA)
- Exhibit No. 4 - Written comments of
State Senator Patricia Hale (WA)
- Exhibit No. 5 - Written comments of Mr. Haler
- Exhibit No. 6 - Written comments of Mr. Kilbury
- Exhibit No. 7 - Written comments of Mr. Beaver

Table of Contents (Concluded):

Exhibits:

Exhibit No. 8 - Written comments of Mr. Greenfield
Exhibit No. 9 - Written comments of Mr. Lindberg
Exhibit No. 10 - Written comments of Mr. Peltier
Exhibit No. 11 - Written comments of Mr. Oliver
Exhibit No. 12 - Written comments of Mr. Dobbin
Exhibit No. 13 - Written comments of Mr. Boland
Exhibit No. 14 - Written comments of Mr. Jacobson
Exhibit No. 15 - Written comments of Mr. Anderson
Exhibit No. 16 - Written comments of Ms. Brown
Exhibit No. 17 - Written comments of Mr. Culley
Exhibit No. 18 - Written comments of Ms. Babilon
Exhibit No. 19 - Written comments of Mr. Beach
Exhibit No. 20 - Written comments of Mr. Watrous
Exhibit No. 21 - Written comments of Mr. Ruge
Exhibit No. 22 - Written comments of Mr. Guttenberg
Exhibit No. 23 - Written comments of Ms. Oglesbee
Exhibit No. 24 - Written comments of Mr. Paglieri
Exhibit No. 25 - Written comments of Mr. Contini
Exhibit No. 26 - Written comments of Mr. Baker
Exhibit No. 27 - Written comments of Ms. Paglieri
Exhibit No. 28 - Written comments of Mr. Zimmerman
Exhibit No. 29 - Written comments of Ms. Burk
Exhibit No. 30 - Written comments of Mr. Troyer

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, we'll go ahead and get started. Good evening, and thanks for coming today to the U.S. Department of Energy's programmatic environmental impact statement meeting on accomplishing expanded civilian nuclear energy research and development and isotope production missions in the U.S., including the role of the Fast Flux Test Facility. And thankfully this is also known as the nuclear infrastructure PEIS, and if I refer to it, that's what I'll do this evening.

I'm Jim Parham, and I'm your facilitator tonight. It's good to be back. I always enjoy coming to meetings here; a very, very courteous and wonderful group to work with. We have a lot of people, as you can see in the audience tonight, who will want to get a chance to comment at the microphone. I'll go through all that explanation and bore you for a minute about how we'll get to that.

But most importantly, as a facilitator, I need to tell you that I'm not an employee of the Department of Energy, nor am I a representative of them. But I actually am a professor at Indiana University in Indiana, and work

1 in the area of park management, having
2 responsibility at one time in my life for the
3 national parks here in your area. So it's good to
4 be back.

5 I've been asked to facilitate this
6 meeting in an open and impartial manner, and I
7 guarantee you I'll do that. I need to make sure
8 that you leave here today feeling satisfied that
9 DOE's provided you an overview of the proposed
10 action analyzed in this PEIS, and answered some of
11 your questions that you may have to the extent
12 possible, and most importantly, given you an
13 opportunity to comment on the scope of this PEIS.

14 I would really ask that you help me
15 this evening in giving everyone a chance to comment.
16 This means extending the courtesies that you want as
17 a speaker and commenter to those up at the
18 microphone. Sure, we're going to have some
19 divergent viewpoints. You may not agree with what's
20 being said, or whatever, but I can tell you I will
21 be very, very concerned if we have people who are at
22 the microphone and people are booing, hissing,
23 clapping, or whatever. I'm really not interested in
24 getting into that this evening. This is not a
25 popularity contest. More importantly, it's very
26 important because we have a court reporter over

1 here, and he has to hear what's being said, and if
2 we don't have -- if we can't hear, we can't get it
3 down on paper, and that's what a big part of this
4 meeting's about.

5 This is one in a series of seven
6 scoping meetings to be held. Meetings were also
7 held at Oak Ridge, Tennessee and Idaho Falls, and
8 this week the Department of Energy folks have been
9 on the road in Seattle, Portland, Hood River, and
10 tonight in Richland. And there'll be one more
11 meeting next week in Washington, D.C. I think you
12 get a couple days off, and that may be welcome at
13 this point.

14 The comment period began on September
15 15th, 1999 and runs through October 31st, 1999. Let
16 me repeat that. The closing date on the comment
17 period on this is October 31st, 1999. Comments
18 received after that date will be considered to the
19 extent practicable.

20 These hearings are just one way that
21 you can provide input to DOE on the proposed action
22 addressed in the PEIS. And up here on the board I
23 show a few other ways that are also in your packet.
24 DOE, to me, seems to do a good job of providing ways
25 to get information to them via nontraditional means

1 such as e-mail, faxes, or you can go the snail-mail
2 route as traditional mail, or whatever.

3 But you also have a comment form in
4 your packet tonight which is a really good
5 opportunity to fill it out here and hand it to
6 someone at the front desk, or to Charlotte, who's
7 here, or Sydel, who's up here; and/or as you give
8 written comments at your microphone and you want me
9 to take them, Charlotte and I, or someone, will be
10 there to grab them from you and we get them right
11 into the court reporter's hands to make sure they
12 get entered into the record.

13 When you registered tonight – and if
14 you didn't register, you may want to do so out at
15 the front – you should have received a packet with
16 a comment form in it. It also has tonight's
17 presentation in it, and that'll be a brief
18 presentation by Ms. Colette Brown from the
19 Department of Energy that'll go about fifteen or
20 twenty minutes at this point. During the
21 presentation, I'm going to ask that you hold your
22 questions to the end of that presentation, please,
23 and we'll take about ten or fifteen minutes of
24 questions and answers on that presentation, and then
25 move into the comment period. Oral and written

1 comments are given equal consideration by the
2 Department in these matters.

3 There's some other material at the
4 back table – and I guess it's over on this side –
5 that's available, including an expert panel report
6 forecasting future demand for medical isotopes, the
7 Federal Register Notice of Intent, or NOI, as many
8 people know it, and several NASA brochures on some
9 of the space programs. And that material is
10 available.

11 Let me just go back over the format
12 of tonight's meeting because some people have asked
13 about it. And it is a little different than maybe
14 what you've seen in the past, but in fact it's a
15 format we've used before, four or five times this
16 past week, as well as we've used here in the past.
17 And as I said, one of the purposes tonight is to get
18 some information from DOE. That'll go very quickly,
19 and then we'll move into Q&A on that; that'll go
20 quickly. We'll take a few questions, and then we'll
21 move into the comment session.

22 The NOI published – talked about the
23 comment session being a period where individuals
24 have five minutes and representatives of
25 organizations have ten minutes. So when you come to

1 the microphone, we'll need to know if you're
2 representing yourself or an organization.

3 Elected officials this evening will
4 go first. I have a list of what looks like seven or
5 eight here. We'll start with Federal officials,
6 move to state, city, county, and we'll go through
7 elected officials first, or representatives of those
8 elected officials who may be bringing a letter or
9 whatever out here this evening.

10 And then we'll move into the question
11 and answer period — excuse me; comment period. And
12 at the comment period, I will not — as you saw,
13 there's no sign-up sheet at the front, and I will
14 call on people randomly out of the audience — you
15 don't know me; I don't know you — and we'll just go
16 through the list of people, and I think you'll find
17 that it's about the fairest way to do it.

18 And we have two microphones out here.
19 There's a tradition sometimes in some places to line
20 up at the microphone. Please don't do that. What I
21 plan on doing is, I'll call someone from this side
22 of the room first, and as they come up to the
23 microphone, I'll select someone from this side of
24 the room to be ready to come up to this microphone,
25 and then we'll just keep alternating back and forth

1 at the microphones. But don't come up early until
2 we call you, and don't stand in line behind someone
3 because there's a chance we'll take a break and
4 you've been standing there for ten or fifteen
5 minutes, and we need to take a break.

6 We will take a break or two. These
7 meetings have been running fairly lengthy, and
8 there's some people who can get up and move about,
9 but the people at the front don't get that
10 opportunity. So I definitely will get that break
11 time in there at some point, at appropriate times,
12 when it looks like we've got a natural break or
13 whatever.

14 One of the things that's important to
15 talk about is what this scoping process is about.
16 And the DOE people -- and after talking to them
17 again about the format and what is really at hand
18 here, is that they're looking for comments directly
19 related to the scope of this PEIS, so please keep
20 that in mind. However, comments -- you may have
21 comments addressing indirectly this issue, or other
22 comments on DOE matters here at Richland, or
23 whatever, and these comments will be directed to the
24 appropriate offices, too.

25 As I said, we have the court reporter

1 here taking notes. We may ask you at some point
2 this evening to repeat your name if we missed it, or
3 whatever. It's not mandatory that you do that, but
4 that would be wonderful if you would.

5 Also up with Colette today is Shane
6 Johnson, Special Assistant to the Director, Office
7 of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. And he's
8 responsible for the programmatic development of the
9 PEIS and has been on the road show this past week,
10 too. And he'll be up here to answer questions and
11 answers, and Colette and him will both take those
12 comments.

13 We will, basically, during the
14 comment section, just stick with comments. We're
15 not going to open it back up to Q&A at that point,
16 because you'll find that we have a lot of people who
17 want to comment, and we'll not get back into an
18 extended discussion because it sort of messes up the
19 time
20 frame.

21 There are other DOE officials here,
22 as you would expect, from Richland and Headquarters
23 staff, and if we need to call upon them, they'll be
24 introduced so you know who they are and what their
25 expert area is, and then we'll get them to help
26 answer questions if needed.

1 It's very important that we use the
2 microphones tonight because of the large size of the
3 crowd. If you're going to comment, I will be having
4 my handy-dandy associate here, Chris, who's been
5 doing a great job of timing these, and I will sort
6 of, not rudely, but try to give you the - "It's one
7 minute left" for the five-minute individuals, or
8 "It's one minute left" for the ten-minute
9 organizational speakers, representatives. And then
10 at that I'll give you maybe thirty seconds, and I'll
11 just let you know, and then we'll need to summarize
12 at that point, whether five- or ten-minute pieces.

13 And again, it's very important that
14 if you do want to summarize and provide your written
15 comments, we'll take those, and you don't need to
16 use all of the five minutes for certain.

17 But I think it's moved pretty
18 smoothly, I think. The last couple of nights, with
19 similar-sized crowds, though, we were past the
20 published deadline of 9:00 p.m. by, oh, two or three
21 hours, I think, each evening. It's been going to
22 11:30 or midnight. And that's not East Coast time.
23 It's been here.

24 And I look forward to working with
25 you. And again, I'm going to run a fairly tight

1 ship and keep this moving. As I walked out of the
2 room a couple of nights ago, there was a gentleman
3 in the back of the room, and he looked at me – and
4 it was, I think, 12:15 or so as I was walking out,
5 and he looked at me and he said, "Sir, does your mom
6 know you do this for a living?" That had a big
7 impact on me, so I will tell my mom this weekend
8 what I do, I've decided.

9 Anyway, thanks for coming. I'd like
10 to introduce Colette Brown for a presentation.
11 Again, hold your questions, and we'll get to that
12 right after this. Thank you.

13 (Presentation by Ms. Colette Brown was given)

14 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks for bringing
15 the lights up.

16 I guess we'll take about ten minutes
17 or so here, take a few questions, and then we can
18 move on.

19 **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

20 THE FACILITATOR: I'll go start on
21 this side of the room. Are there any questions from
22 this side of the room? We'll start right here with
23 the gentleman right by the microphone.

24 MR. NORM BUSKE: Thank you. My name

1 is Norm Buske. And I -- this question concerns what
2 missions are not included and it, in particular,
3 relates to your last comment on not defense
4 missions. My understanding is that basically it's
5 the -- the way this works is that the missions are
6 all civilian that it's to be brought up on, if it
7 comes up, if FFTF comes up, but that ten minutes
8 after it would come up, then it could be put into
9 defense production, and -- unless there was a
10 congressional mandate not to do so. If that is the
11 case, and that was my understanding from your
12 comment also in Seattle -- if that is the case, it
13 makes it very difficult for the public to comment
14 on because we're missing, you see, so much of the
15 picture. And what I -- so my question is, am I
16 correct that, in fact, if DOE gets it up on the
17 civilian mission platform, that it can take defense
18 production missions -- or, not missions, but
19 clients, and if so, how does the public comment on
20 that so that -- because, see, it's sort of
21 invisible. Thank you.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. COLETTE BROWN: I don't think it
24 would be wise for me to predict, you know, what
25 might happen in ten years, and you know, whether or

1 not this country is going to have an important
2 national security mission that would require the use
3 of the facility. But I can tell you that I mean
4 what I say when I say this mission base that we've
5 identified is civilian in nature. Now, should the
6 facility -- should a new mission come up that has
7 national security implications that would require
8 the use of the facility, I suspect that that would
9 require a separate NEPA review. And although an EIS
10 might be classified, it would still involve a
11 nonclassified public participation activity, so you
12 would have an opportunity at that point to comment.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Colette.
14 Move to this side of the room, or -- with any
15 additional clarifying questions on the presentation,
16 anybody? Show of hands, anyone who would like to
17 ask a question?

18 Yes, sir. Could you come to the
19 microphone, please? Thank you. Get it for the
20 record.

21 MR. GERRY POLLET: Thank you. Within
22 the scope of any of these alternatives, do you
23 consider contractually expanding your capacity
24 essentially by private contract or contract with the
25 Canadian government, rather than your own

1 infrastructure, within the scope of any of these
2 particular alternatives?

3 MS. COLETTE BROWN: No. The scope of
4 this is -- involves the expansion of the United
5 States' nuclear facility infrastructure, although,
6 like in the case of plutonium-238, an option is
7 purchasing it from Russia, the material from Russia.
8 But not the expansion of someone else's
9 infrastructure; no.

10 MR. GERRY POLLET: No, I think you
11 misunderstood me. Not expanding their
12 infrastructure, but essentially accomplishing the
13 same thing as you would do with the Russian
14 contract; meet your capacity projection through
15 contracts, whether it's someone -- the contract with
16 the guy who bought the Texas Super Collider Super
17 Conductor accelerator parts, or with the Canadian
18 government. Is -- by contract, meeting your
19 capacity for something other than Pu-238, is that
20 part of any of them?

21 MS. COLETTE BROWN: That has not been
22 considered.

23 MR. GERRY POLLET: Okay.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.
25 Questions from this side of the room? Is there any

1 additional questions? Yes, sir, right here. Sorry
2 for the long walk, but we really do appreciate you
3 getting it on the mike.

4 MR. MARK BECK: Yes. My name is Mark
5 Beck. The question I have is in – your listing
6 here – future demands for medical isotopes. There's
7 projections of 7 to 14 percent increases that are
8 expected for years, and it states that there are
9 possible shortages of these isotopes. In
10 calculating the shortages, what assumptions were
11 made about future production, be it from Canada or
12 from other – other sources? Is that just assuming
13 current facilities? Or what are the assumptions
14 under which there are expected to be shortcomings?

15 MS. COLETTE BROWN: Shane, do you
16 want to help me with that?

17 MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Yeah. Excuse me;
18 yes. The underlying assumption on the forecast for
19 shortages is based on the existing production
20 capabilities both domestically and internationally.

21 MR. MARK BECK: Okay. Thank you.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.
23 Additional questions at this time? I don't see any
24 questions at this time. Oops, sorry, I – we'll

1 have to bring you all the way to the front. Sorry
2 about that.

3 This is the last question I'll take,
4 and then we'll move into the comment period.

5 MR. BILL STOKES: Thank you for
6 bearing with my long walk.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

8 MR. BILL STOKES: My name is Bill
9 Stokes. One of the items that were identified in
10 the PNNL 30-day report and took a look at -- oh,
11 thank you -- and took a look at the NERAC decision
12 talked about the opportunity to look through the EIS
13 process at the private sector funding and
14 commercialization options. I didn't see that
15 relative to the options that were identified on the
16 set of alternatives as to where you factor those
17 issues in, and I wanted to know where you would take
18 a look at alternative financing processes versus --
19 you know, against -- Federal financing options
20 versus private financing options. Thank you.

21 MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Yes, the PNNL
22 report did include that, but with respect to this
23 NEPA document we are not currently proposing to get
24 into how the implementation of the various
25 alternatives would be handled financially.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay, thank
2 you. Thanks.

3 We'll go ahead and move now into the
4 comment period, and I – as I said before we have –
5 we'll take elected officials first, and then move
6 into the public comment period.

7 Tonight we'll have an opportunity to
8 hear a variety of viewpoints, and please, please
9 extend the courtesies that you'll expect at the mike
10 to the others. As Colette referred to this as the
11 beginning of the process with scoping, with a
12 timetable that will end up bringing them back here
13 next year with hearings. At these public meetings,
14 however, they've been running a little long, as I
15 said, so at some point we will probably take a break
16 or two. I just wanted to point out the two exit
17 doors in the back. And also the restrooms are
18 nearby, pretty much ample locations, and with this
19 crowd, it's good to know that.

20 If you have a medical condition that
21 would require you to go early in this randomness
22 process, or you have a real matter with the
23 babysitter or a real conflict, if you would let
24 Charlotte know – and Charlotte, stand up, please,
25 and show them who you are – let Charlotte know by

1 waving over to her or whatever, so we can get your
2 name early to get you out of here for a dialysis, or
3 a sick kid, or whatever. Because we – these go
4 quite a long time, and at four or five hours, you
5 may need to take a break.

6 This opportunity includes going
7 through a list of elected public officials, and so
8 what I'd like to do is to, either mike that they
9 choose, to start with the elected public officials,
10 and of course we'll start with state congressional
11 and senatorial. And I understand that – I believe
12 – and I've got a lot of different names – Suzanne
13 Heaston from Slade Gorton's office is here from the
14 U.S. Senate.

15 **COMMENT SESSION**

16 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SENATOR SLADE GORTON

17 MS. SUZANNE HEASTON: Thank you. I
18 have a statement from United States Senator Slade
19 Gorton.

20 "Cardiovascular disease is the number
21 one killer in America. Cancer affects one in three
22 people in the United States. Arthritis and other
23 rheumatic conditions affect 43 million Americans –
24 daunting statistics, statistics that are represented
25 by real people and their suffering. Medical
26 isotopes are used in new, cutting-edge technologies

1 in treating cancer and other diseases without the
2 usual debilitating side effects, and at a lower cost

1 than traditional treatments. 'Smart bullets' with
2 medical isotopes have achieved up to 95 percent
3 success in treating certain cancers. However, our
4 nation is facing documented shortages of research
5 and treatment quantities of isotopes because we
6 lack adequate production capabilities. We lack
7 enough facilities to produce the variety, quantity,
8 and quality of lifesaving isotopes that are
9 necessary to conduct research and treat our
10 patients. In this scoping meeting for the Nuclear
11 Infrastructure Programmatic Environmental Impact
12 Statement, PEIS, I urge the Department of Energy to
13 consider, first and foremost, the commitment the
14 Federal government is required under Section 31 of
15 the Atomic Energy Act to keep, to supply research
16 and production quantities of isotopes.

17 "Isotopes are made and used in
18 various ways, from nuclear waste, as in yttrium-90,
19 which has been found very effective in treating
20 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; accelerator-produced
21 isotopes, such as fluorine-18, used in diagnostic
22 tests like PET scans; and reactor-produced, such as
23 iridium-192, which is used to help prevent arteries
24 from reclogging after angioplasty. In assessing our
25 nation's needs, all methods of isotope production to

1 provide a reliable, diverse supply for researchers,
2 and production capabilities for diagnostic and
3 treatment quantities, must be evaluated.

4 "This report should include a
5 thorough critique of projected waste streams from
6 the operation of facilities utilizing" – "utilized
7 in meeting our needs. Sound science will accurately
8 inform the public of the type and quantity of waste
9 generated. The public will thereby have credible
10 information that relies on proven science, instead
11 of out-of-context pseudoscience that is currently
12 disseminated in scare-tactic forms by activist
13 groups.

14 "A detailed cost analysis of how to
15 meet our nation's nuclear infrastructure needs
16 should also be addressed in the PEIS. Funding
17 requirements for the construction of new facilities
18 must be compared to resuming operations at the Fast
19 Flux Test Facility. We have already invested
20 millions in a premier facility that is capable of
21 fulfilling a significant share of our future nuclear
22 infrastructure needs. That investment must not be
23 disregarded.

24 "Finally, any programmatic assessment
25 of our nation's nuclear infrastructure should also

1 include an evaluation of our educational
2 opportunities for training future scientists.
3 Creating a safer and cleaner environment will
4 require highly skilled students of nuclear science
5 and engineering. We must have facilities such as
6 test reactors for hands-on learning for young
7 researchers. These future scientists are the very
8 people we will rely upon in the 21st century to meet
9 technological challenges such as nonproliferation,
10 fuels development, and spent nuclear fuels.

11 "I appreciate the opportunity to
12 provide these additional suggestions for the scope
13 of the PEIS, to complement the reported scope of
14 evaluating steady-state neutron sources for medical
15 and other isotopes, plutonium-238 for NASA long-term
16 needs, and conventional nuclear research and
17 development needs.

18 "Most importantly, though, through
19 its isotope program, the Department of Energy has an
20 opportunity to greatly improve the quality of life
21 for millions of Americans who suffer from cancer,
22 cardiovascular, and other diseases. I urge the
23 Department of Energy to recognize and embrace its
24 responsibility to provide the quality and quantity
25 of isotopes needed to diagnose and treat our
26 patients."

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Could you put that
3 - thanks.

4 Is there anyone else representing a
5 U.S. congressman or senator here? Yes. Yes, ma'am.

6 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE DOC HASTINGS

7 MS. JOYCE DE FELIZ: I'm Joyce de
8 Feliz, and I'm Congressman Doc Hastings' district
9 director, and I'm here this evening to read a
10 statement on his behalf.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

12 MS. JOYCE DE FELIZ: And I'd like to
13 present the original copy of his statement, which he
14 has signed, to you, and I also have additional
15 copies for the media in case they should inquire.

16 Again, I'm reading this statement on
17 behalf of Congressman Doc Hastings.

18 "Thank you for allowing me the
19 opportunity to share my views with you this evening.

20 "Most of us know someone with cancer
21 or have seen a loved one suffer from cancer. Recent
22 developments in the medical isotope field suggest
23 that our ability to combat deadly cancer strains
24 will be revolutionized by these new medical

1 isotopes. That is why I believe that it is vital
2 for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
3 to consider the benefits provided by the production
4 of medical isotopes at FFTF during the scoping
5 process. Section 31 of the Atomic Energy Act
6 requires the Federal government to maintain research
7 and production quantities of isotopes. The FFTF has
8 the unique ability to produce a steady stream of
9 different medical isotopes simultaneously at one
10 reactor. FFTF offers the added benefit of allowing
11 the government to meet its statutory
12 responsibilities at a low cost to taxpayers.

13 "The growing research field
14 surrounding medical isotopes has tremendous
15 potential to improve the lives of millions of people
16 worldwide. There have been many highly successful
17 clinical trials in the treatment of several major
18 classes of cancer and other medical problems.
19 Medical isotopes offer innovative new ways to treat
20 cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and other
21 rheumatic conditions.

22 "Restarting FFTF would increase the
23 reliability and the diversity of medical isotopes
24 while stabilizing the supply of these promising
25 disease fighting tools. The rapid growth of this

1 field could support the majority of the costs to
2 operate the reactor. It is vital that the EIS take
3 into account the growth of medical isotope treatment
4 options and the corresponding increase in this
5 market. Further, the EIS should determine the
6 amount of future health care cost that would be
7 avoided by using these isotopes.

8 "The PEIS should also include the
9 benefits of increasing the Federal program in
10 isotope production not only in medicine but also in
11 the supply of radioisotopes that are essential for
12 biological and agricultural research, food
13 irradiation, and numerous other industrial uses that
14 would benefit the entire nation.

15 "Because cost is an essential
16 component of the decision of FFTF's future, it
17 is important to consider the cost associated with
18 restarting FFTF in comparison with the cost of
19 constructing a similar reactor or new alternatives
20 – such as accelerators – to conduct FFTF's mission
21 in the future. The United States has spent over \$1
22 billion on FFTF to make it a premier facility. I am
23 confident that FFTF is capable of fulfilling a
24 majority of our future nuclear infrastructure needs
25 at a lower cost to American taxpayers than any other
26 option.

1 "Further, the PEIS must include a
2 detailed account of the benefits provided for
3 research and education. We must ensure that this
4 nation maintains the ability for American students
5 to learn firsthand the challenges associated with
6 nuclear reactors. Research is an essential
7 component to ensure further developments in the
8 nuclear field.

9 "I appreciate the opportunity to
10 provide the Department with these recommendations
11 for inclusion in the PEIS. I hope that the EIS
12 provides an authoritative, objective account of all
13 issues surrounding the nuclear infrastructure of the
14 United States and the benefits provided to all
15 Americans through the use of medical isotopes to
16 treat the worlds deadliest and most debilitating
17 diseases."

18 Thank you.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

20 Okay. Were there any other state –
21 excuse me; Federal-elected officials? If not, we'll
22 move to state-elected officials, governor,
23 representing the governor, or state legislators. I
24 think I saw at least a name or two here, state –

1 Yes, ma'am.

2 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF WASHINGTON STATE

3 REPRESENTATIVE SHIRLEY HANKINS

4 MS. V.J. MEADOWS: Good evening.

5 Representative Shirley Hankins deeply regrets that
6 she is unable to attend this meeting. My name is
7 V.J. Meadows, and I will be reading her statement.

8 "As the widow of a cancer patient, I
9 would like to emphasize to you that medical isotopes
10 for the treatment of cancer must be a number-one
11 item in your review. My family has lost a number of
12 members to cancer. In fact, my cousin is in
13 treatment today for breast cancer. I am asking for
14 your consideration in this matter because I believe
15 adamantly that the Fast Flux Test Facility should be
16 utilized for research and educational purposes.
17 There are thousands and thousands of people who
18 would benefit from the cancer treatments derived
19 from this facility, perhaps your mother or your
20 child. Many countries and many national agencies
21 could use this facility to the betterment of all
22 mankind. We no longer have the luxury of listening
23 to the anti-forces opposing growth and education in
24 the medical field.

25 "I don't wish to be repetitive with

1 my comments, but I do believe that in reality we
2 have an opportunity to save a lot of people's lives,
3 and we need to do just that.

4 This process should be on clear and
5 accurate science, not the misinterpretations of a
6 few who gather to demoralize our community."

7 Thank you.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
9 have a copy of – thank you.

10 Any other elected public officials
11 representing the state or state legislature?

12 No? We will now move to those in the
13 county and city government. I would – here at
14 Richland, I suppose – Larry, you're the mayor here.
15 Do you want to come up just to start us off on the
16 county officials, since you're the local –

17 MR. LARRY HALER: I don't know if I
18 should have come up here for Pat Hale, but she's
19 also given me a letter, and I'd like to take my time
20 to not only talk about – to read Pat Hale's letter,
21 but – Senator Pat Hale.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

23 MR. LARRY HALER: And then also talk
24 – my notes, also.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

1 MR. LARRY HALER: Okay?

2 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

3 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF WASHINGTON STATE SENATOR

4 PATRICIA S. HALE

5 MR. LARRY HALER: On behalf of

6 Senator Pat Hale. She says here –

7 "Thank you for the opportunity to
8 comment on the environmental impact statement for
9 the potential restart of the Fast Flux Test
10 Facility. I applaud your efforts to fully and
11 fairly evaluate the FFTF. The FFTF is a valuable
12 resource that should be used to help our mission" –
13 or, "to help our nation meet its critical research
14 needs; in particular, the production of medical
15 isotopes. The United States has not been able to
16 meet the demand for isotopes to treat cancer.
17 Cancer kills more than one and a half million
18 Americans each year. Conventional treatments for
19 cancer are time-consuming, have debilitating side
20 effects, and are costly. Medical isotopes will save
21 lives and improve the quality of life for those
22 being treated. The cost for treating people with
23 medical isotopes is estimated to be 50 percent less
24 than traditional costs. The savings of the
25 Medicare/Medicaid system should not be ignored,
26 either.

1 "This EIS process provides the public
2 input on the future of FFTF. I encourage the
3 Department to study all credible and factual
4 information it has gathered."

5 And I'll give this to you when I'm --

6 THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

7 STATEMENT OF LARRY HALER

8 MAYOR, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

9 MR. LARRY HALER: On behalf of the
10 Richland City Council and the citizens of Richland I
11 would like to welcome everybody here this evening.
12 I hope that we do continue to have rational,
13 thoughtful discussion on this. I have chosen for my
14 topic this evening the FFTF restart/deactivation
15 costs. The reason that I've chosen this is that I
16 was asked to come back and testify before the NERAC
17 committee on July 29th of this year on behalf of the
18 FFTF, in which I presented the NERAC committee with
19 Governor Locke's statement on his support of the EIS
20 process and the potential restart of the FFTF for
21 medical isotopes, as well as the state senate and
22 the state house of representatives resolutions,
23 along with a letter from Senator Gorton and from
24 Senator -- and from Congressman Hastings.

1 But at this point I'd like to talk
2 about the FFTF restart and deactivation costs, and
3 I'll read my statement here.

4 The program scoping plan for the FFTF
5 was issued to the Department of Energy on August
6 1st, 1999 by Battelle at the Pacific Northwest
7 National Labs. It states that the approximate three
8 and one half year effort to restart the reactor
9 would cost \$229 million if the DOE decides to use
10 the FFTF. Costs would start after the announcement
11 in the Record of Decision and cover system upgrades
12 and activation.

13 The program scoping plan also
14 compared costs to restart with deactivation if DOE
15 determines that the FFTF is not needed and permanent
16 shutdown is required. The total estimated cost to
17 complete the deactivation is \$199 million spread
18 over approximately six years. Again, costs would
19 start after the announcement in the Record of
20 Decision and cover system deactivation, fuel
21 processing to above-ground storage, and sodium
22 drain.

23 The FFTF business model was developed
24 using guidelines provided in DOE Order 2110.1A,
25 "Prices of Department Materials and Services," USDOE

1 1992, and benchmarked against current business
2 models at other DOE reactor sites. Constant 1999
3 dollars were used to develop the model, and the
4 assumptions for the model were reviewed and agreed
5 to by the DOE Chief Financial Officer's Office. Dr.
6 Howard Kaufold, Director of Executive MBA Program at
7 Wharton Business School, University of Pennsylvania,
8 independently reviewed the full model.

9 Unplanned delays, for example, legal
10 actions to delay restart, could cause the estimated
11 costs to increase. These delays would postpone the
12 production of greatly needed isotopes and increase
13 the associated costs.

14 The program scoping plan for the FFTF
15 clearly states the estimated costs. The Hanford
16 Public Interest Network, HPIN, claims that Battelle
17 underestimated the costs of restarting and
18 overestimated the costs of shutting down the FFTF.
19 While the HPIN referenced the document, they took
20 the information out of context by quoting only part
21 of the text with the intent to mislead the public.
22 It should be noted that PNNL issued a statement
23 saying it stands behind its numbers.

24 And the key points that I'd like to
25 make this evening are:

1 The program scoping plan for the Fast
2 Flux Test Facility was very clear;

3 The FFTF business model was developed
4 using DOE guidelines;

5 The FFTF costs were benchmarked
6 against future current business models and models at
7 the DOE reactor sites;

8 Constant 1999 dollars were used to
9 develop the model, and delays will add to inflated
10 dollars;

11 HPIN took information out of context,
12 and PNNL stands behind its numbers.

13 And I thank you very much for the
14 opportunity to speak this evening.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

16 Moving into either city or county
17 officials, I will just look for anyone who would
18 like to come up. I think –

19 Yes, sir. I recognize you from last
20 night. Could we – yeah. Thank you. Go to the
21 mike. Thank you. I'm going to have to send you
22 back there.

23 STATEMENT OF CHARLES KILBURY

24 MAYOR, PASCO, WASHINGTON

25 MR. CHARLES KILBURY: I am Charles

1 Kilbury, mayor of the City of Pasco, and I have a
2 very short statement.

3 There are among us those with no
4 great knowledge of science who castigate
5 radioactivity without understanding that we are
6 surrounded by it and suffer no consequences as a
7 result.

8 I would wager that the same attitude
9 was greeted when we first discovered fire in the
10 long-distant past, until someone became bold enough
11 to try it, and it gave us its warmth and
12 benevolence.

13 We are, and are now obtaining much of
14 our radioisotopes from foreign sources, which means
15 there can be, and are, delays in receiving them. We
16 have an excellent source in the Fast Flux Test
17 Facility which can provide us with almost the entire
18 spectrum of radioactive substances, including in
19 some cases radioactive atoms which are unobtainable
20 elsewhere and have the property of seeking out and
21 destroying cancer cells. It is well that we
22 consider and take advantage of this fact, for if we
23 deny ourselves the use of these radioactive bullets,
24 we may well have no other source for them.

25 Thank you for listening.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Okay,
2 thank you.

3 Additional county or – yes, sir. Go
4 ahead. You beat me to the punch. Here, I'll take
5 it.

6 STATEMENT OF JAMES R. BEAVER

7 MAYOR, KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON

8 MR. TOM WALKER: Thanks. Charles the
9 Magnificent is a very hard act to follow.

10 (Laughter.)

11 My name is Tom Walker, Kennewick City
12 Councilman. I'm here representing the mayor and the
13 city council of the City of Kennewick. Mr. Beaver
14 was unavailable to attend tonight. I'd like to read
15 his statement.

16 "The City Council of the City of
17 Kennewick supports inclusion of the Fast Flux Test
18 Facility as an alternative for consideration in
19 meeting this Nation's needs to deal with issues of
20 nonproliferation fuels development and testing;
21 isotope production for medical and industrial
22 purposes; nuclear research and development; and
23 plutonium-238 production for space exploration, but
24 to name a few. The FFTF can do all this and more.
25 It is an existing asset and investment that should

1 be put to beneficial use for its useful life on
2 behalf of the taxpayers who funded its construction.

3 "This Council did not make such a
4 recommendation lightly. This reactor is in our
5 community backyard. As a body of elected officials,
6 we must be concerned about community safety above
7 all else. FFTF is safe. It was designed,
8 constructed, maintained, and operated on the basis
9 of modern commercial reactor standards. It is
10 located within a building that meets stringent
11 containment criteria. It has integral safety
12 systems designed to automatically shut down if
13 abnormal conditions are detected.

14 "FFTF has undergone the same plant
15 design review and final safety analysis report
16 review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
17 Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards has been
18 applied to all other commercial reactors. During
19 start-up, a comprehensive series of acceptance tests
20 were performed to confirm the adequacy of the test
21 – of the plant design, including the cooling of the
22 core by natural circulation during an emergency.

23 "FFTF has the capacity to meet the
24 Department's needs, and it is a proven safe reactor
25 that is paid for. It should be the preferred

1 alternative for meeting the Department's varied
2 missions noted above."

3 Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir. Thanks.

5 STATEMENT OF GERALD R. GREENFIELD

6 MAYOR PRO TEM, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

7 MR. GERALD GREENFIELD: I'm Gerry
8 Greenfield. I'm mayor pro tem from Richland, and I
9 just want to make a brief supplement to our mayor's
10 statement.

11 I read in the paper that in one of
12 your past hearings, that one person was in
13 opposition to the FFTF and said he didn't want to
14 hear any more about sick people. But that's the
15 reason we want to see the FFTF restarted. My family
16 has been touched by the medical and emotional
17 impacts of cancer.

18 The specialists in cancer all say
19 many isotopes hold great promise to substantially
20 improve cancer patients' survival. Few isotopes are
21 available in the United States. The FFTF would
22 reverse this situation, and therefore – thereby
23 reduce the cost of research and treatment.

24 We are all concerned with the wastes
25 of isotope production. Although your evaluation

1 should protect the public from the effects of waste,
2 you should also recognize those wastes are
3 incomparable with those weapon-grade production
4 wastes.

5 I encourage you to weigh the merits
6 of the FFTF's benefits against the disadvantages so
7 we can improve our health. Thank you.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

9 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF

10 THE COMMISSION OF THE PORT OF BENTON

11 MR. BEN BENNETT: Thank you very
12 much. My name is Ben Bennett. I'm the executive
13 director of the Port of Benton, and I'm here to read
14 a letter from the Commission of the Port of Benton
15 as signed by Hal Lindberg.

16 "The Port of Benton supports the
17 restart of the FFTF for the production of
18 radioisotopes to help treat cancer patients.

19 "The Port's district includes all the
20 Department of Energy's Hanford reservation located
21 in Benton County, and many of our properties border
22 on
23 the site. The Port district was formed in 1958,
24 along with the City of Richland, to be an economic
25 development agent related to the eventual downsizing
26 of the site, a role that the Port has been very

1 successful at over the past forty-one years. Over
2 that four decades, the Port, city, and county
3 taxpayers have continued to back efforts to find
4 other uses for former DOE facilities and properties
5 by bringing in private companies and identifying new
6 uses. We believe that the FFTF is one of the most
7 valuable and promising yet offered to this
8 community.

9 "Financially, redirecting the use of
10 the Fast Flux Test Facility from its original
11 mission of developing radioisotopes for weapons to a
12 humanitarian purpose for protecting people from
13 various types of cancer is an obvious way to
14 recapture much of the very large amount of monies
15 spent in bringing the facility to its current
16 efficiency level. This mission is the most economic
17 and humanitarian use that can be made of this
18 facility.

19 "Nuclear energy, like all natural
20 forces, need to be thoroughly understood, and then
21 directed toward uses that benefit mankind. Nuclear
22 energy is not all bad. Indeed, without it there
23 would be no life on this planet. Our life-giving
24 sun, upon which we all depend, is a nuclear reactor.

25 "Over the eons that life has evolved

1 here on this planet as a result of the solar
2 radiation from the sun, mankind has made use of
3 almost all the natural energy sources found here.
4 Again, the life-producing radiation from our sun has
5 provided us the opportunity to discover ourselves
6 and the other forces of the natural world.

7 "And over the past six decades, the
8 people of the earth have learned how to control and
9 use nuclear power, and found that our natural
10 supplies here on the small planet can be put to use
11 for the benefit of all people when they are properly
12 managed.

13 "The new mission for the FFTF is an
14 unique example of how far we have come in our
15 education of nuclear forces and energy. Let's not
16 now destroy a unique chance we have to provide a
17 very valuable means of bettering life for all of us
18 for this new purpose."

19 And it's signed "Hal Lindberg,
20 Commissioner of the Port of Benton."

21 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

22 Yes. Oh, yes, sir. Go ahead.

23 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF JERRY A. PELTIER

24 MAYOR, WEST RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

25 MR. STAN STAVE: My name is Stan

1 Stave, and I'm the city administrator for the City
2 of West Richland. A letter has already been
3 provided here. Let me read a copy of it, please.

4 "The Department of Energy's decision
5 to restart the Fast Flux Test Facility would allow
6 active U.S. participation in the technologies of
7 proliferation-resistant fuels research that would
8 improve the likelihood that other existing and
9 future nuclear-capable nations adopt a
10 nonproliferation fuel cycle.

11 "The U.S. policy on plutonium recycle
12 has not yet been fully adopted by other nuclear
13 powers. These nations are interested in supporting
14 nonproliferation, but at this time do not have
15 alternatives to assure their energy future. If
16 effective nonproliferation fuel cycles were
17 developed and available, these nations would likely
18 adopt such alternatives. If the U.S. does not take
19 a leadership role in the development of alternative
20 fuel cycles, it is unlikely that it would occur.
21 This would mean that the current plutonium recycle
22 program would continue, thereby increasing the risk
23 of diversion of plutonium and other weapons-usable
24 materials to terrorist nations or organizations.

25 "Give the Fast Flux Test Facility a

1 new job: protecting the country and saving lives."

2 This is by Jerry Peltier, Mayor, City
3 of West Richland.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

5 Any other elected public officials?

6 Yes, ma'am.

7 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE
8 BOARD OF BENTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

9 MS. DONNA NOSKI: I'm Donna Noski,
10 director of administrative services for Benton
11 County, and I'm reading into the record a letter by
12 the Board of Benton County Commissioners and signed
13 by Chairman Claude Oliver.

14 "We request that you thoroughly
15 assess the costs versus benefits of therapeutic
16 nuclear medicine in the near term and 20 to 30 years
17 hence, with special emphasis on the unique needs of
18 an aging population.

19 "As part of this quantified
20 assessment, we urge you to carefully assess the
21 effectiveness of therapeutic nuclear medicine
22 compared to other favored alternatives. This
23 comparison should include short- and long-term costs
24 and benefits, both direct and indirect.

25 "We also believe that a fresh look at

1 the United States' reliable production capability of
2 medical isotopes is in order. The blue ribbon team
3 forecast substantial increases in isotope demand.
4 In particular, your EIS scope should provide for
5 careful analyses and comparisons relative to the
6 needs of the medical isotope researcher and clinical
7 trial team versus the needs of a fast-growing
8 medical isotope industry requiring large quantities
9 of FDA-approved medical isotopes.

10 "In all cases, the downside risk to
11 human life, suffering, and cost needs to be
12 evaluated assuming we continue with inadequate
13 supplies of medical isotopes in the face of rapidly
14 increasing demand.

15 "Thank you for this opportunity to
16 comment. Claude L. Oliver, Chairman."

17 Also attached is an FFTF EIS scoping
18 statement. Thank you.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Any other elected
20 public officials?

21 Yes, sir.

22 STATEMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBER KEN DOBBIN

23 WEST RICHLAND, WA

24 MR. KEN DOBBIN: Yes. Good evening.
25 I'm Councilman Ken Dobbin, West Richland.

1 If the FFTF doesn't restart, how many
2 lives will be lost? That's the overriding question
3 of those fighting for their lives, fighting for the
4 lives of their parents, their children, their
5 neighbors, fighting against diseases such as cancer
6 and heart disease. It's most important to them that
7 this environmental impact process look at the impact
8 of that. And included in that is the impact of
9 delays if new construction is chosen. We believe
10 that's a NEPA requirement, and it's certainly a
11 requirement of us local governments here in the
12 mid-Columbia region.

13 We must also sort out the technically
14 incorrect information and testimony. Ever since the
15 FFTF had a real chance at restart, opponents have
16 been making false statements and inconsistent logic
17 -- and they use inconsistent logic. They spin
18 fiction stories to scare the public into buying
19 their stories. This fiction belongs in
20 entertainment, not medicine, science, or
21 engineering. So far I have not heard one legitimate
22 reason why we shouldn't restart.

23 I testified in Seattle and Portland
24 to refute that false testimony. I want to be sure
25 that when society realizes that there is actual loss

1 of life here, that there's no elected official that
2 can say, "I didn't know. I didn't know that there's
3 a shortage of medical isotopes." I testified that
4 people, patients in Seattle, have been denied
5 treatment with palladium-103 and iodine-125.
6 Clinical trials have been stopped using copper-67
7 because of lack of supply.

8 I don't want them to say, "I didn't
9 know that the FFTF was safe." Based on the physics,
10 automatic shut-down systems, and its containment
11 dome protects the public from even the worst case
12 hypothetical accident.

13 I don't want them to say, "I didn't
14 know that the FFTF produces less waste than even the
15 submarines operating in Puget Sound." Every year we
16 see those submarines being transported and buried on
17 the Hanford Project, and their fuel must be disposed
18 of in the same way FFTF's is. And take that huge
19 Trojan reactor vessel sent here by the State of
20 Oregon. The FFTF can operate for thirty-five years
21 and not produce that amount of low-level waste.
22 When I spoke of this hypocrisy in Portland, a man in
23 the audience right beside me said, "Well, we'll take
24 it back."

25 (Laughter.)

1 Indeed. Indeed they should. Indeed
2 they should, before any Oregonian says that we
3 cannot produce medical isotopes in FFTF because we
4 produce a little waste. And before Seattle joins
5 Oregon in this deed, let them bury the submarine
6 compartments in King County, not Benton County.

7 And the most widely spread falsehood
8 is that we will steal cleanup money. But what will
9 really happen is, if the Secretary decides not to
10 run the FFTF, not to choose it, then it will go from
11 the nuclear energy budget into cleanup budget. And
12 guess what? I think our opponents are right on one
13 case. It's a zero-sum game. So where is the money
14 going to come from? Out of the waste tank cleanup.
15 So what do we get? We get less cleanup money, and
16 cancer patients die. That's a tragedy.

17 Opponents can't seem to separate FFTF
18 from the Hanford defense cleanup. They use that to
19 obfuscate and hoodwink the public. I predict that
20 the public will see through that and their trickery.
21 The FFTF should be separated from the rest of the
22 Hanford missions in assessing this PEIS.

23 The DOE should consider the following
24 complementary missions: plutonium-238 for space
25 batteries; space reactor development; safety systems

1 research; basic science, fusion, and materials
2 research. It should include transmutation of waste,
3 proliferation-resistant fuels research and
4 development, and computer chip hardening. From my
5 twenty-five years' experience as a nuclear engineer,
6 I know these missions are complementary in a
7 versatile FFTF.

8 And finally, I want to state that DOE
9 has only two operating reactors that must do all of
10 the missions that the public expects it to do. I
11 believe that the FFTF is the best choice among the
12 alternatives to perform many of these missions
13 without delay and associated financial and human
14 costs of waiting for new construction. Let's all
15 support the restart of the FFTF.

16 Thank you.

17 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

18 Any other elected officials?

19 Yes, sir.

20 STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE PORT OF KENNEWICK

21 MR. NORM ENGLEHART: My name is Norm
22 Englehart. I'm a commissioner at the Port of
23 Kennewick speaking on behalf of the Port of
24 Kennewick this evening.

25 In a Port of Kennewick special

1 meeting held November 26th, 1996 in which there was
2 only one item on the agenda, the commissioners voted
3 unanimously for a resolution supporting the Fast
4 Flux Test Facility. My purpose here this evening,
5 almost three years later, is to reiterate for the
6 record the Port of Kennewick Commission's continued
7 support for FFTF and its restart. Thank you.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

9 Any other elected public officials at
10 this point? That's one of the other reasons I like
11 the West compared to where I live in the Midwest.
12 No elected official took their allotted time
13 available to them.

14 (Laughter and applause.)

15 That won't happen in my state, trust
16 me.

17 Thanks a lot. Appreciate the
18 comments. We're going to keep moving right along,
19 and as I mentioned before, the comment period now
20 will run as long as we need to get everybody
21 satisfied that their comments were heard. And I
22 will do that by a show of hands. Let me just
23 reemphasize that there's a stipulation in the NOI
24 that says five minutes to individuals and ten
25 minutes to organizations. Chris and I will also

1 remind you of that at some point during that talk.
2 We need to have you come to the microphones, and
3 please let's keep this on the wonderful courteous
4 and polite level we have so far this evening.

5 As we said, the last couple of days
6 we've been out on the road, and people have been
7 staying till 1:00 in the morning or later. And
8 it's been quite a remarkable experience. And
9 occasionally I make a mistake and not call on
10 someone who asked me -- said they had to get on a
11 bus, or whatever, so I will -- before I do the first
12 show of hands, I know there's a lady here that I
13 missed three or four times, who finally ended up
14 having to walk out on me a couple of nights ago at a
15 meeting. So I see her here this evening.

16 I think that's you, and could you go
17 ahead and go to this mike? We'll start with you
18 because that's -- either one -- 'cause I overlooked
19 you and that was not right, and --

20 STATEMENT OF LAUREL PIIPPO

21 MS. LAUREL PIIPPO: How could he
22 overlook me in this outfit?

23 (Laughter.)

24 I was at the hearing in Portland on
25 Tuesday evening, and we did have to leave. Contrary

1 to what one of the speakers said, I wasn't a
2 three-hour immigrant who came crashing in to try to
3 promote my point of view. It involves thirteen
4 hours. And I want to welcome the people from Hood
5 River, and Portland, and Spokane, and any place in
6 Oregon, any place in the Pacific Northwest, whose
7 major concern is that horrible mess created
8 fifty-five years ago, or whenever, should be cleaned
9 up. It definitely has to be cleaned up. And
10 starting – or, restarting FFTF should not and will
11 not interfere with the cleanup mission.

12 I moved here in 1951, and our family
13 now includes thirteen people. I'm the only one who
14 has cancer. If one in three people is going to have
15 cancer, I think I've taken the hit for the first
16 three rows.

17 I want to tell you about my
18 experience in treatment with cancer because when I
19 read about medical isotopes and smart bullets, and
20 people who can be treated with non-Hodgkin's
21 lymphoma and other exotic kinds of cancer, I am very
22 interested in having a kinder, gentler treatment
23 than what I have been through. As you see, it says,
24 "Stop slash," meaning repeated surgeries, cut off a
25 chunk of your anatomy –

1 THE FACILITATOR: We need to get you
2 to the microphone.

3 MS. LAUREL PIIPPO: Okay.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah. Sorry.

5 MS. LAUREL PIIPPO: Well, you can
6 just read my shirt.

7 Oh, you mean you can walk around with
8 it? How wonderful.

9 Look. She's taking chemotherapy.
10 See the hair come out? She's taking chemotherapy.
11 I just talked to her this afternoon and learned that
12 she has non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, a lump in the mouth,
13 so she's taking chemotherapy. And she hasn't had
14 the slash, as I have, for breast cancer, which then
15 recurred. She will go into the burn. That's the
16 good old-fashioned radiation treatment which burns
17 you, and turns you red, and you blister. And then
18 two years later, when you start cracking ribs, the
19 doctor says, "Oh, radiation weakens your rib." So
20 does chemotherapy. Then your arm will swell up like
21 a watermelon and you'll wonder what the hell. And
22 you'll find out, oh, that's lymphedema. That's
23 because they removed your lymph glands.

24 And radiation is not a little smart
25 bullet. Radiation is buckshot. It hits the whole

1 side of your body, ribs, and everything, and arm,
2 and you swell up, and you have to wear a fashion
3 statement. \$201 for this special custom-made deal.

4 So after the first breast cancer,
5 then a year later – I was totally pissed off – I
6 got lung cancer. I mean, I paid my dues. And so a
7 hunk of the lung was removed by surgery. More
8 slashing. Wouldn't it be nice to have a smart
9 bullet? You know, good old FFTF.

10 But I went to Canada. Three times I
11 flew to Ottawa to get vaccinations to prevent a
12 recurrence of lung cancer. This was in 1991. And
13 people say, "Well, did it work?" Well, this is
14 1999. They think it works if you're still alive
15 five years later.

16 So then after that, the breast cancer
17 recurred. More slash, more surgery. And then they
18 decided burn, which was very good because
19 chemotherapy is as close to being in hell as I ever
20 want to be. And after having that chemotherapy, and
21 having the breast cancer recur, I thought if they're
22 going to do chemotherapy, just shove me in the
23 grave. I am not going to go through it.

24 So it does astonish me when someone
25 says, "We don't want to hear about your sick people.

1 FFTF kills cleanup." It doesn't. We have to clean
2 that up. Thank God you're highly vocal and
3 opinionated, and you're going to raise the devil
4 with Congress. Clean it up, clean it up, clean it
5 up. But please remember, there are people who can
6 be treated with medical isotopes.

7 Marge, I want you to talk to Bob
8 Schenter and find out if medical isotopes will apply
9 to your condition. Excuse me for mentioning it in
10 public, but we haven't had a chance to talk.

11 MS. MARJORIE MARIS PETERSON: Well, I
12 was going to be Exhibit A anyway.

13 MS. LAUREL PIIPPO: Well, let's talk.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Fifteen seconds.

15 MS. LAUREL PIIPPO: Thanks.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

17 MS. MARJORIE MARIS PETERSON: Can I
18 be next? 'Cause I'm the one she's talking about.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah, you can go
20 ahead. I want to go over the other side of the room
21 after this. Okay? So that's —

22 MS. MARJORIE MARIS PETERSON: Okay.
23 I'll try to make it short.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, go ahead.

25 MS. MARJORIE MARIS PETERSON: Okay. I

26 —

1 THE FACILITATOR: Let's keep it
2 there. There. You got it?

3 MS. MARJORIE MARIS PETERSON: Okay.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

5 MS. MARJORIE MARIS PETERSON: I seem
6 to be Exhibit A here tonight, but I do have
7 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and I am having
8 chemotherapy. I've had only one chemotherapy
9 treatment. I have several more ahead, and then
10 radiation therapy. And as she's already
11 demonstrated, my hair comes out very easily, so next
12 week I'll be wearing a wig. But it's very good
13 looking. I've already bought it.

14 I came to Hanford to work on the
15 Manhattan Project in 1943. Didn't have a clue what
16 we were doing. And this was an "H" of a place to
17 work, but we stayed here, and we built something
18 because we had confidence in our scientists and
19 engineers and those that knew what we were doing.
20 And it did save my husband's life because he was in
21 the Navy when the bomb fell.

22 My husband's an engineer. He worked
23 on the project for thirty-five years. He climbed
24 all over reactors, he designed parts of the

1 reactors, and he still doesn't glow in the dark.

2 Anyway, you know I'm on chemo, and
3 I'm going to have radiation. I just think we need
4 to save this thing that works. Why do we have a
5 facility we've spent millions on to build, to tear
6 it down when there's still a good use for it, a
7 healthy use for it? It doesn't make sense to me to
8 build a beautiful castle, but because we aren't
9 living in it, we'll tear it down. Or maybe it
10 doesn't have good air conditioning or something.
11 Why don't we keep FFTF?

12 And I've already given you my visual
13 demonstration, so I'll sit down, but let's keep
14 FFTF.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

16 We'll come to this side of the room.
17 And again, a show of hands of who would like to
18 comment. I'll start at the back this time because I
19 didn't do that. I got you for the questions
20 earlier, so I feel a little better about that.

21 The gentleman here in the blue shirt.

22 Okay. And as you come up here – the
23 people on this side of the room, who wants to speak
24 from stage – my stage – whatever side this is.
25 Just one of you? Yeah. Sir? Yeah. After that.

1 So okay, go ahead.

2 STATEMENT OF JOHN BOLAND

3 MR. JOHN BOLAND: My statement does
4 not have anything to do right now with the scoping,
5 but I do have to make a statement that might have
6 something to do with the procedures.

7 I -- may I turn around and address
8 the group, if I can?

9 Down in Portland after I had made my
10 statement -- I'm being attacked by a microphone.

11 Down in Portland after I had made my
12 statement I was approached outside by a couple of
13 different people. One was a lady that wanted to
14 talk to me about the Trojan reactor, the vessel.
15 And I made some statements about nuclear energy, and
16 she suddenly -- I mean, she was a nice-dressed lady,
17 very articulate, and suddenly she just stepped back
18 and she looked at me, and she said, "That's bull-S."
19 And I said, "Oh, now wait a minute. Take me to
20 task. Please make me prove these kind of things."
21 I was trying to get her to establish a dialog with
22 those of us up in the Tri-Cities. As she walked
23 away, she said, "That's Bull-S."

24 And for the last couple of days since
25 the Portland hearing, I was thinking there's got to

1 be some better way of getting a dialog between
2 science and emotion, if we can eliminate the
3 emotion. So I put this statement together this
4 afternoon.

5 For the better – I call it a plea
6 for peace. And by the way, there are copies of
7 these that I've left around out on some of the
8 tables.

9 For the better part of 20 years, I've
10 attended and participated in many hearings such as
11 this on the FFTF. Over that time I have observed
12 the decline in civility and information transfer,
13 and the rise of invective and extreme animosity of
14 many of those testifying. It appears that now there
15 are clear lines drawn with far too much separation
16 between the sides, Western Washington vs. Eastern,
17 environmentalists vs. the Tri-Cities, anti-nukes vs.
18 pro-nukes, etc. ad-nauseam. Isn't it way past time
19 for a change?

20 We need to realize that we're all in
21 this together. God forbid there occur a major
22 adverse event at Hanford. Oregon and Southeast
23 Washington may be on the banks of the Columbia
24 River, and Seattle may be affected by some perverse
25 prevailing wind. Though that is someone else's back

1 yard, it's the Tri-Cities front yards and living
2 rooms. Those who view themselves as opposed to most
3 activities in the Tri-Cities should consider
4 Tri-Citians as allies in the battle to clean up
5 Hanford in the shortest possible time. Trust that
6 Tri-Citians are the first line of defense for the
7 rest of the Pacific Northwest. No one will scream
8 louder or knock over more tables to get attention
9 than the Tri-Citians who are keeping a much closer
10 eye on Hanford than anyone else. The great majority
11 of Tri-City residents believe our environment is as
12 safe or safer than Seattle or Portland. We boat,
13 fish, and swim in the Columbia River. We breathe
14 the air, drink the water, and a great number of us
15 work at Hanford. We value our children, our
16 elderly, and ourselves no less than anyone living
17 outside our area.

18 In attending many hearings, it seems
19 the Tri-Cities is being blamed for the radioactive
20 legacy of World War II and the cold war at Hanford,
21 which is patently unfair. Sadly, there are
22 instances of companies and industries not willing to
23 locate here due to the misperception, fomented in
24 great part by the media in the northwest, that it is
25 not safe to live here. The sooner Hanford is

1 cleaned up, the sooner those misperceptions will
2 disappear. Additionally, dissatisfaction with DOE
3 is no reason to be unfair to the hundreds of
4 thousands of medical patients whose lives could be
5 saved, and extreme pain mitigated by the use of
6 nuclear medicine for cure and diagnostics of cancer,
7 osteoporosis, AIDS, and many other maladies.
8 Without prejudice, we must investigate the
9 possibility of using FFTF, or any other reasonable
10 supplier, for the production of isotopes. Let's be
11 sure FFTF can be operated safely with only a tiny,
12 easily handled waste stream, and with no effect on
13 Hanford cleanup.

14 At a time when the U.S. seems to be
15 awash in budget surplus revenue, let's join together
16 to pressure Congress and the Administration to
17 increase the Hanford cleanup budget. Please let's
18 set aside preconceived perceptions and emotions. We
19 really can become a team to make good things happen
20 instead of spending most of our time, energy, and
21 emotions trying to destroy "the other side."

22 Let's start a real dialog. We can
23 set up discussion groups, debates, references to Web
24 sites or periodicals, or supply any and all
25 information anyone desires. Let's make it, "Your

1 place or mine," not no place at all.

2 And I have left some of these around
3 the outside. It's got -

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

5 MR. JOHN BOLAND: - e-mail, and fax
6 numbers, and phone numbers for me, if you will
7 contact me. And I will certainly put you in touch
8 with a lot of folks here who will share lots and
9 lots of information, either here, or wherever you
10 are.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

12 STATEMENT OF MARLENE OLIVER

13 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CANCER PATIENTS

14 MS. MARLENE OLIVER: My name is
15 Marlene Oliver. I'm here tonight representing the
16 National Association of Cancer Patients.

17 I just wanted to say it's very
18 gratifying that people in this community, and
19 including elected officials, recognize the benefit
20 of nuclear medicine and how it can help cancer and
21 other patients.

22 Three out of four families in this
23 country will be affected by cancer. The information
24 you're about to hear tonight comes from the Centers
25 for Disease Control, the National Institutes of

1 Health, the National Cancer Institute, Medicare, the
2 Health Care Finance Administration, and studies that
3 have been reviewed and published in medical
4 journals.

5 I said that three out of four
6 families will be affected by cancer. Nearly one out
7 of two males will develop cancer. Nearly one out of
8 three females will develop cancer. These are real
9 numbers, and the numbers are increasing every year
10 as the baby boom ages. How can we stop this? We
11 need to make research, we need to make isotopes
12 available to these patients who are suffering.

13 I would like to address the lady with
14 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma is a
15 fatal disease. It claimed King Hussein of Jordan
16 and Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. There are at least
17 two people in this room who suffer from
18 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma this evening. 60,000
19 patients a year develop this disease, and with a
20 study I read on medical isotopes, smart bullets can
21 cause 100 percent of these cancers to shrink. It
22 can cause 71 percent of these cancers to disappear
23 with a single outpatient treatment, and without the
24 side effects that Laurel talked about.

25 The main complaint of patients who

1 undergo studies with medical isotopes in the few
2 treatments that are available to the general public
3 -- because doctors have to write down every
4 complication -- is that it's boring. Wouldn't it
5 have been nice for this lady in the red shirt,
6 Laurel, to say, "My treatment for cancer was boring,
7 and it only took a single outpatient treatment, and
8 then it was gone"? That's what we want to hear. We
9 want cancer patients to be diagnosed and cured
10 during their first round of treatments, and this can
11 happen.

12 This lady had several surgeries. 60
13 percent of cancer patients have surgery. Another 60
14 percent have a second surgery. Why is that? Well,
15 obviously because the doctor didn't get all the
16 cancer the first time. What doctors do in surgery
17 is, they stand there and they look at the cancer,
18 and they remove what they can see.

19 I'm a consultant for new medical
20 technology, and have been for the last twenty years.
21 I'm one of the ones who tells doctors what they
22 don't know about, and I guarantee you that over 90
23 percent of the doctors in this country have no idea
24 what medical isotopes are used for, either for
25 diagnosis or for treatment. These tiny pockets of

1 cancer that are left behind are what causes problems
2 down the road.

3 How are we going to pay for all this?
4 Everybody goes, "It's going to cost so much money to
5 operate FFTF. It's already cost so much money."
6 Well, let me tell you, there is a law on the books
7 called the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. It asks
8 government departments to save each other money. I
9 would love to see a headline in the newspaper that
10 says, "DOE Saves Medicare." Let's give DOE some
11 good press. Let's give them the opportunity to
12 start FFTF.

13 And I'd also like to mention that
14 cancer patients like to be treated where they live.
15 They don't want to have to travel all over the
16 country because some of these isotopes are very
17 short-lived. I would ask the DOE in its scoping to
18 consider building many FFTFs dedicated to medical
19 isotope production first, and to other missions as
20 need be, as outline in the scope of the EIS. If
21 there is an isotope with a half-life of two hours,
22 how are you going to get it to New York? It ain't
23 gonna happen.

24 How are we going to pay for this? By
25 eliminating just half of second surgeries by

1 targeting remaining cancer cells with medical
2 isotopes, Medicare would save a minimum of one
3 billion dollars – that's with a B. It costs, in
4 1993, an average of \$15,000 to care for a dying
5 cancer patient. \$15,000. By using medical isotopes
6 to help target these patients who have no further
7 reason to hope to live other than with medical
8 isotopes, Medicare, again, would save a minimum of
9 one billion dollars a year just for treating bone
10 cancer patients alone.

11 By making isotopes that are not
12 available right now – they're on back order – to
13 patients with prostate cancer, just 5 percent
14 because prostate cancer seeds work just as well as
15 surgery, and with a new design on the horizon,
16 prostate cancer seeds will work better than surgery.
17 They should. This would save another \$800 million.

18 What about suffering? We talked
19 about breast cancer, we talked about lung cancer, we
20 talked about non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. For prostate
21 cancer patients who have surgery, half become either
22 impotent or incontinent, or both. That is generally
23 accepted in the medical literature.

24 A patient a year and a half ago opted

1 for prostate seeds implanted into his prostate to
2 attack his cancer –

3 (Facilitator adjusting microphone.)

4 That's okay. If you gotta do it, you
5 gotta do it.

6 And he told his wife he still wanted
7 to be able to make love to her, and I quote, "I
8 don't want to wear a diaper the rest of my life."

9 Another patient, George, had his
10 prostate surgery in 1992 before this treatment
11 became available to the general public. He's been
12 wearing a diaper every since.

13 Gerry, another prostate cancer
14 patient, was more recently diagnosed. There is a
15 back order of palladium-103 and iodine-125 to fill
16 these seeds, and he doesn't know what to do. He
17 wants to have the seeds. Gerry, we hope, will not
18 be the one out of two men who develop this
19 complication.

20 I ask all of you in this room to
21 please write to the White House, who asks for what
22 should be put in the budget. Write to the DOE. Ask
23 your – both your senators, ask your representative.
24 We need to make this a national effort. Letters
25 need to come in from all over the country. They do
26 have an impact. The money that FFTF and other

1 facilities like it could save Medicare is in the
2 tens of billions of dollars, not just for cancer,
3 but for other diseases.

4 Thank you very much.

5 THE FACILITATOR: In my usual
6 pointing problems, I pointed to two people at the
7 same time. So we'll go here, and then the gentleman
8 here in the maroon shirt on the corner. Yeah.
9 After this.

10 STATEMENT OF GERRY POLLET

11 HEART OF AMERICA NORTHWEST

12 MR. GERRY POLLET: How many people
13 here -- for that portion of the medical isotope
14 demand that cannot be met by the private sector, how
15 many people here believe that we should use the
16 least cost, lowest cost facility to meet that
17 demand? Show of hands.

18 AUDIENCE: [*Simultaneous comments.*]

19 MR. GERRY POLLET: Is it greed?

20 THE FACILITATOR: No, we don't --

21 MR. GERRY POLLET: Is it greed?

22 That's what a lot of people are
23 wondering because there are alternatives to
24 producing medical isotopes.

25 Oh, I'm sorry; I'm representing Heart

1 of American Northwest. Gerry Pollet.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

3 MR. GERRY POLLET: We're going to
4 hear tonight -- it may be 10:00
5 o'clock, it may be midnight by the time other people
6 get to speak, but we're going to hear about
7 lower cost alternatives such as high neutron flux
8 linear accelerator, lower cost, greater range of
9 isotopes, other alternatives including the private
10 sector, Canada. And I dare say, to the rest of the
11 region, a lot of people are saying, "Is it greed
12 that people say it's FFTF or nothing?" Is it greed?
13 Is it self-interest? And think about that.

14 Now, lowest cost. Battelle produced
15 a report that said it would cost only \$230 million
16 to restart FFTF, and \$190 million to shut it down.
17 That \$190 million ironically included \$40 million a
18 year for two years of standby because the Department
19 of Energy, Battelle said, would not have the money
20 to simply invest \$19 million extra in shutdown
21 costs. And so it costs 190 to shut down if you
22 can't find an extra 19 million for shutdown in the
23 next couple of years. But it only costs \$230
24 million to restart, and they got that figure by
25 leaving out the standby costs for four to six years

1 of standby and basic surveillance and maintenance,
2 while moving towards restart.

3 In April of this year, Battelle
4 produced for the Department of Energy what became
5 the approved budget baseline for the restart of
6 FFTF. It's pretty amazing because the approved
7 budget baseline for restart for the same exact
8 missions is \$145 million more than the report to the
9 Secretary claimed.

10 Now, this region had a commitment
11 from the Department of Energy for what I call cancer
12 prevention. That's what cleanup is. It's disaster
13 and cancer prevention. The Department of Energy in
14 1995 said "When FFTF is shut down, we commit that
15 the funds saved" -- at that time, \$32 million a year
16 -- "would be used towards meeting the Hanford
17 cleanup compliance gap." This region expects that
18 to be lived up to. We need that money, and we need
19 it desperately for cleanup.

20 The Department of Energy moved \$32
21 million a year, or Congress moved it at their
22 request, out of the environmental management cleanup
23 budget, permanently reducing the Hanford cleanup
24 budget baseline, and moved it into the nuclear
25 energy budget to pay for the standby costs of FFTF

1 for FY99. If you don't believe me, I do have the
2 documents -- some of the documentation with me.

3 Why do we need that \$32 million a
4 year? Next year we, all of us, and our children,
5 and our grandchildren, all of us together, face a
6 \$232 million compliance gap at this site. \$232
7 million. That is an incredible compliance gap. The
8 Department of Energy has a plan called the
9 Accelerating Cleanup -- I like to call it
10 Decelerating Cleanup -- and it calls for level
11 funding Hanford cleanup at the same level it is at
12 right now through the year 2006. Not even an
13 increase for inflation, folks. You know what that
14 means? Every year you get less work done, 'cause
15 inflation happens.

16 And here's what the Department of
17 Energy, April 15th this year, told -- what RL told
18 headquarters this meant. "Termination of all
19 environmental restoration activities in the 100- and
20 300-Areas along the Columbia River. Only partial
21 support of plutonium stabilization. Continuation of
22 significant threat to the nearby Columbia River and
23 Richland city limits during a fire or seismic
24 release scenario." That ought to worry you. We're
25 talking about facilities in the 300-Area, some of
26 which are proposed for some of the ancillary support

1 work, where, in the event of a fire or earthquake,
2 the expected dose to a member of the public who is
3 allowed in that area now is 90 rem. I'm not going
4 to start going into what rems are. Many of you
5 understand that. That's DOE's risk data sheet. 90
6 rem.

7 So we need this money. \$32 million a
8 year pays for three-quarters of the actual work
9 along the Columbia River. It can clean up a
10 significant chunk of the 300-Area and reduce risk to
11 all of us. We need that money. We need that
12 commitment lived up to.

13 Adding new waste to noncompliant
14 leaking facilities is not in anyone's self interest.
15 FFTF itself doesn't produce a lot of waste except
16 for the spent fuel, which is in a form and has a
17 plutonium content that is not acceptable at Yucca
18 Mountain. And that means your great grandchildren
19 will probably be worrying about how to guard it here
20 on site. Will it ever leave the parking lot behind
21 FFTF? That's a good question that needs to be
22 considered here.

23 As the Hanford Advisory Board said,
24 DOE in its EIS and related documents should factor
25 in restrictions on new wastes going to facilities

1 that are noncompliant or have potential
2 uninvestigated releases. The impact of additional
3 wastes on the inadequate budget of the site must
4 also be factored into the decision. This was stated
5 in regard to the pending decision to ship more waste
6 here, but it applies equally to generating more
7 waste here.

8 We are talking about generating large
9 quantities of waste from the missions. This is from
10 one set of proposed missions. DOE's Web site and
11 fact sheets disclose, for transuranic waste, not at
12 all. Mixed transuranic waste – that's hazardous
13 mixed with transuranic – not at all. One proposal,
14 a major part of the mission, as you can see, creates
15 a lot of waste. The middle column is what the site
16 generates annually now, baseline. In other words,
17 two-thirds of the amount of low-level waste. A
18 great deal of transuranic waste at a time when this
19 site cannot afford to dig up the buried and leaking
20 transuranic waste containers in our soil.

21 The total cost -- well, wait a
22 minute. Liquid high-level nuclear waste from
23 plutonium processing. If you make plutonium-238
24 here, you use the aqueous processing –

25 THE FACILITATOR: One minute.

1 MR. GERRY POLLET: - and you will
2 have additional wastes added to the high-level
3 nuclear waste tanks. Under DOE's current plan, only
4 10 percent of Hanford's liquid high-level nuclear
5 wastes will be removed from those tanks by the year
6 2018; 10 percent by 2018, current costs, \$6.9
7 billion. And we will add more waste into those
8 leaking explosive tanks, tanks for which, when it
9 comes to double-shell tanks, we know that we've run
10 out of additional capacity in the next several years
11 for double-shell tanks. Are we going to add more?
12 Doesn't make sense. What everyone learned in
13 kindergarten applies here. Clean up your mess
14 before you make new one. It's simple. And that's
15 what the rest of the people in this region expect.

16 The tank wastes threaten the Columbia
17 River. They threaten human health and the
18 environments. They threaten all of us.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Ten minutes.

20 MR. GERRY POLLET: Ten minutes?

21 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

22 MR. GERRY POLLET: I will wrap up,
23 then, and just say if you want the region to unite
24 for the main mission of Hanford cleanup funding,
25 you've got to work and make sure that we're not

1 making more. You've got to expect that the region
2 expects that we focus on cleanup if you want us all
3 to work for the dollars. Right now, more energy is
4 being expended by some senators and congressmen
5 seeking \$12 million more for FFTF than was expended
6 to increase your cleanup budget.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

8 MR. GERRY POLLET: And that's sad.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Thank you.

10 STATEMENT OF GEORGE JACOBSON

11 MR. GEORGE JACOBSON: My name is
12 George Jacobson. I guess I thought this was about
13 three specific missions for FFTF, and not cleanup.
14 I think that was the subject of another hearing.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Are you
16 representing yourself, sir?

17 MR. GEORGE JACOBSON: Yes, I'm
18 representing myself.

19 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thanks.

20 MR. GEORGE JACOBSON: Semiretired,
21 whatever that means. I think it means I work for my
22 wife.

23 As a mechanical engineer, I really
24 believe all three missions are extremely worthy, but
25 I'm only going to speak about isotopes because

1 that's what I know the most about.

2 I have three points that I'd like to
3 make. First of all, a plea that you please, please,
4 look into real data. I really don't think that two
5 or three or a handful of doctors showing up in
6 Seattle really represent the hundreds, the thousands
7 that are out there that can't get materials to treat
8 their patients, including researchers in
9 universities, and other laboratories. Please look
10 at the real data. Those of us that are involved in
11 the isotope business, that have an interest -- I
12 don't work in it; I just have a great interest in it
13 -- we are not afraid to have you look at the raw
14 data, to look at the real facts. The only thing we
15 can't do is bring you the patients that didn't get
16 the treatment. And I think that's what that picture
17 is about right there.

18 The second point I'd like to make is,
19 in evaluating the financial considerations -- and I
20 know Mrs. Oliver made this comment already -- please
21 look at the big picture. I understand that your
22 position is to deal with the DOE budget, but there
23 is a far greater impact. My understanding is, bone
24 marrow transplant is around \$250,000. One of these
25 isotope treatments can be anywhere from 4- to 8- to

1 12-, perhaps 20,000. Even if I'm off by a factor of
2 two, the potential cost savings to the Medicare
3 system is phenomenal. So 15, 20, or \$30 million for
4 operating FFTF – in the big picture, this is about
5 people, and not about dollars. Those dollars are
6 small when you look at the whole Medicare system.

7 The other point I'd like to make is,
8 I firmly believe isotopes are needed. A few people
9 talked about getting them from other countries like
10 we do now, but a PET scan, for instance, the
11 half-life of the isotope that's used for that is
12 only a few hours. You cannot fly it in from Canada,
13 Eastern Canada, or anywhere else. It has to be
14 produced close to the instrument. We can't expand
15 the breadth of the materials that we need, the
16 research that's being done. There are other
17 possibilities for arthritis and AIDS and other
18 things that have been mentioned.

19 I believe FFTF is the safest, most
20 regulated reactor that that job can be done in. I
21 want to see it stay in this country. I want to see
22 the research done in this country. The legacy of
23 Hanford – some things were done – weren't done
24 right, but we're a free country, we're not living
25 under Hitler or communism because of it. FFTF was

1 designed to the latest regulations. Operation of a
2 nonregulated reactor? What reactor in this country
3 is nonregulated? Come on. Ridiculous.

4 So I believe FFTF, with its natural
5 circulation properties, its operation at low
6 pressure, its design to the newest standards, is the
7 best place to do it.

8 Thank you very much.

9 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

10 We'll go over here.

11 STATEMENT OF BOB ANDERSON

12 BENTON COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE

13 MR. BOB ANDERSON: Yes. My name is
14 Bob Anderson, and I'm chair of the Benton County
15 Democratic Party Central Committee. And we had a
16 meeting, our monthly meeting, last night, and we
17 passed the following resolution that I'd like to
18 read into the record.

19 "Whereas medical isotopes are
20 increasingly being used in research and in providing
21 new, cost-effective, cutting-edge technologies for
22 the diagnosis and treatment of disease, including
23 cancer, heart disease, and arthritis; and

24 "Whereas the United States is
25 importing more than 90 percent of the

1 reactor-produced medical isotopes currently used to
2 save a significant number of the lives of our
3 citizens; and

4 "Whereas market projections for
5 utilization of medical isotopes for diagnosis and
6 treatment show our country will need new production
7 sources to assure a domestic supply to meet the
8 increasing demand; and

9 "Whereas the Hanford Fast Flux Test
10 Facility, FFTF, has unique capabilities for
11 providing large quantities and a wide variety of
12 high quality medical isotopes; and

13 "Whereas the FFTF was designed,
14 constructed, and safely operated as a
15 state-of-the-art reactor with world-class isotope
16 production capabilities and is the newest, most
17 sophisticated reactor in the U.S. Department of
18 Energy complex, and as such is an irreplaceable
19 national asset; and

20 "Whereas the FFTF is presently being
21 maintained in a stand-by mode;

22 "Now therefore be it resolved, the
23 Benton County Democratic Central Committee hereby
24 encourage U.S. Department of Energy Secretary
25 William Richardson to order the restarting of the
26 FFTF."

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir. How
3 about you, and then --

4 STATEMENT OF MARK BECK

5 CITIZENS FOR A CLEAN EASTERN WASHINGTON

6 MR. MARK BECK: Hello. My name is
7 Mark Beck. I'm from Walla Walla, and I'm here
8 representing Citizens for a Clean Eastern
9 Washington. I'm also an assistant professor of
10 physics at Whitman College, so I know a little bit
11 about science.

12 The first thing I'd like to point out
13 is, a lot of the basis for this programmatic
14 environmental impact statement is the assumption
15 that the DOE must supply these isotopes; whereas
16 they're also pointing out that these are mainly for
17 civilian missions. And I think that if these are
18 really civilian missions and they really stand on
19 their own merits, then the private sector will step
20 to the bat and will come -- will step to the plate
21 and will produce reactors, accelerators, whatever it
22 is, to take care of the problem. It's not the place
23 of DOE to be subsidizing private contractors in
24 doing this mission.

1 In terms of medical isotopes, I think
2 no one here will disagree that medical isotopes are
3 needed. It's an important part of cancer treatment.
4 However, I'd also like to point out that the – in
5 the handout that was given tonight, it said that a
6 blue ribbon panel in 1998 concluded that we will be
7 needing more facilities for producing medical
8 isotopes, and they predicted growth rates of 7 to 14
9 percent. However, in May of 1999, which was after
10 this report was released, MDS Nordine, who is one of
11 the world's largest suppliers of medical isotopes,
12 announced that they are building two new reactors to
13 produce medical isotopes. If these two new reactors
14 come on, that will more than double the number of
15 isotopes that are currently available.

16 Do we need the FFTF? I think we
17 need to go back and look at the assumptions. For
18 plutonium-238, previously the DOE said that it was
19 not a viable source for plutonium-238 production
20 unless the FFTF was restarted for tritium
21 production. Will NASA guarantee that they will buy
22 the plutonium-238? Do we really need this? Is this
23 a viable source?

24 In direct relation to the
25 environmental impact statement, I'd like to say

1 that for any reactor that is considered in this
2 statement, we first need to consider an efficient,
3 optimally designed reactor that is designed to
4 maximize isotope production, minimize waste, and
5 minimize cost. That has to be compared to operating
6 the FFTF, must directly compare the FFTF to the
7 optimal design over the thirty-five-year proposed
8 mission for the FFTF.

9 If the FFTF loses, we have to shut it
10 down and build the optimal design in any reactor
11 scenario. If you're talking about a
12 thirty-five-year time span you really have to talk
13 about what is optimal. I think you're likely to
14 find that if the FFTF is too big, it will produce
15 too much waste, it'll be too costly, and
16 comparatively dangerous to operate. A smaller
17 reactor will be cheaper, will produce less waste,
18 and will be more efficient at producing the isotopes
19 that you want. It will also be able to be tailored
20 more precisely to produce shorter-lived isotopes.

21 Also, any consideration of
22 environmental health and safety impacts and costs
23 must consider all possible waste streams. This
24 includes target fabrication and transportation, fuel
25 fabrication and transportation, spent nuclear fuel

1 from the reactor, the unused isotopes themselves,
2 and all solid and liquid high-level waste generated
3 in processing targets and extracting useful
4 isotopes. All of these have to be considered.

5 And for each of these waste streams
6 you must consider, where will it be stored? And
7 this must be – where the storage will occur must be
8 considered for the entire time that this waste is a
9 threat, not simply just the thirty-five years of the
10 mission. So if some isotopes has a hundred-year
11 half-life and it's got ten half-lives to decay to a
12 safe level, we have to consider storage for a
13 thousand years. So where is it going to be; how
14 much will it cost to store it for a thousand years?
15 Consider health and safety impacts of all these
16 streams.

17 You also must consider health and
18 safety impacts of all credible accident scenarios.
19 Let me point out a few that I think are credible
20 accident scenarios. We currently have liquid waste
21 leaking into the groundwater which is flowing into
22 the Columbia River. It's happening now; it's
23 credible that it will happen again in the future.
24 We must consider the possible health and safety
25 impacts of the waste generated in this production

1 getting into the groundwater and getting into the
2 Columbia. How is that going to impact public
3 health?

4 So what I would like to conclude is
5 by saying you need to reevaluate your assumptions
6 that this entire mission is necessary. I urge you
7 to shut down the FFTF and agree – and live up to
8 your 1995 agreement to use the money that was saved
9 by shutting down the FFTF to clean up the Hanford
10 nuclear site.

11 Thanks very much.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Do you have a copy
13 of your comments?

14 MR. MARK BECK: I'll mail them in.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thanks.

16 I've picked a lady right here, and
17 this'll be the last before we take a quick break.

18 Yes, ma'am.

19 STATEMENT OF PAMELA BROWN

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HANFORD COMMUNITIES

21 MS. PAMELA BROWN: Thank you. My
22 name is Pam Brown, and I'm executive director of the
23 Hanford Communities Organization. I appreciate the
24 opportunity to testify this evening.

25 A common concern of individuals who

1 both support and oppose the restart of Hanford's
2 Fast Flux Test Facility is the disposition of wastes
3 that would be generated from operation of the
4 reactor. The EIS should identify all waste streams,
5 evaluate disposition alternatives, and assess their
6 environmental impact on the region. Of particular
7 interest is whether these wastes can be accommodated
8 at Hanford without impacting the ongoing Hanford
9 cleanup.

10 Based on an analysis of last – based
11 on an analysis done last year of reactor – of the
12 last year of operation of FFTF, it is estimated that
13 airborne radionuclides that would be emitted from
14 the reactor operations would be far below the
15 maximum
16 offsite individual dose of 0.1 millirem per year
17 guidance established for the Hanford site in
18 accordance with applicable Federal and state
19 regulations. This should be verified in the EIS.

20 Nonradioactive waste streams
21 associated with FFTF operation include solid
22 hazardous waste, processed waste water, solid and
23 liquid wastes. Disposition of these wastes should
24 conform to state and Federal regulations.

25 Solid waste that is regulated as
26 dangerous or extremely hazardous waste should be

1 identified. Disposition plans for the material
2 should be explained, and any material destined for
3 disposition at Hanford should be evaluated for any
4 environmental impact to the site.

5 The EIS should consider whether any
6 transuranic or high-level waste will be generated,
7 and where the material would be dispositioned.

8 Information from a preliminary
9 analysis of FFTF operations that has been provided
10 to the Hanford Communities indicate to us that the
11 small amount of waste that will be generated, which
12 would remain at Hanford, can easily be accommodated.
13 It would not impact other site activities or impair
14 cleanup progress, but it is important for these
15 assumptions to be verified and documented in the
16 EIS.

17 We are very confident that if this
18 EIS is done based on a fair factual analysis, that
19 it will come to a conclusion that supports FFTF.
20 This community has not had a good experience with
21 EISs recently being fair and factual, to be very
22 honest with you, and we recognize there's a lot of
23 political pressure in Washington, D.C., but we hope
24 you'll be able to avoid it, and we wish you the
25 best. Thank you.

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

3 It's a couple minutes past 9:00
4 o'clock. We'll come back at ten after. There's few
5 restrooms and a lot of people. Thank you.

6 (Recess, 9:02 p.m. until 9:14 p.m.)

7 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, we'll go
8 ahead and get started. Thanks for coming back. And
9 we'll pick up where we left off with alternating.
10 And again, just to remind of the format if you came
11 in late – and there were a few late registrants –
12 five minutes for individuals, ten minutes for
13 organizations, if that's appropriate.

14 And let's start – well, we'll just
15 start next to the microphone with this gentleman
16 here. Very nice shirt, by the way.

17 STATEMENT OF BOB SCHENTER

18 NUCLEAR MEDICINE RESEARCH COUNCIL

19 MR. BOB SCHENTER: This shirt – oh.
20 I'm Bob Schenter. I'm representing the Nuclear
21 Medicine Research Council, so I guess I get ten
22 minutes.

23 THE FACILITATOR: (*Inaudible*)

24 MR. BOB SCHENTER: This shirt
25 actually is from Indonesia. I was over in

1 Indonesia, and they have an outstanding facility
2 there to make medical

1 isotopes. I hope we don't have to rely on Indonesia
2 to get our medical isotopes, and that'll be one of
3 our major points.

4 Before I start I'd like to comment,
5 and thank the outstanding job that the facilitator
6 and
7 the Department of Energy have done. I've been to
8 several of these hearings, and their
9 professionalism, their integrity, and in my opinion,
10 their fairness should be commented on. And I think
11 that's -- we should do that. Send a letter saying
12 how well they've done that, to keep these
13 proceedings so that everyone has a chance to speak,
14 and everyone is not interrupted. And I think you've
15 done an outstanding job, both the facilitator and
16 the Department of Energy, in answering the
17 questions, and I think we should recognize that.

18 (Applause.)

19 I'm a member of the board of the
20 Nuclear Medicine Research Council -- this is an
21 organization in the Tri-Cities -- and I am a past
22 chairman. The Nuclear Medicine Research Council has
23 developed a letter to Ms. Brown that I'll put into
24 the record. A lot of thought has gone into this,
25 and I hope and request that this letter -- it's
26 three pages -- be looked at very carefully. I think

1 it's full of excellent constructive ideas that – a
2 number of them were presented tonight, mainly
3 focused on the needs for medical isotopes.

4 I won't read the whole letter. I
5 think it reflects a lot of the comments that were
6 said tonight, and it would be redundant. However, I
7 would like to read three recommendations that are
8 proposed. These are very constructive, and I think
9 that's our goal, is to provide constructive --
10 rather than bashing the Department of Energy, rather
11 than bashing Hanford, let's come up with
12 constructive ideas of how we can proceed further.
13 So I'd like to read the three recommendations. I
14 think these are excellent parts of what should be
15 included in the EIS.

16 Recommendation number one: The PEIS
17 scope must include a realistic assessment of the
18 types and quantities of medical isotopes required
19 over the next thirty-five years. The assessment
20 should consider the potential cost savings that
21 medicine – that nuclear medicine has to offer. The
22 assessment must take into account the projected
23 growth of diagnostic application as well as
24 projected growth of treatment applications, with
25 contingencies built in for possible new applications

1 of medical isotopes not identified at the present.
2 This assessment must include input from other
3 Federal agencies, the private sector, medical
4 research organizations, universities, and
5 stakeholders.

6 Recommendation number two: The scope
7 of the PEIS must include an assessment of the types
8 and capabilities of the neutron resources required
9 to assure a reliable supply of medical isotopes for
10 medical researchers and clinicians over the next
11 thirty-five years. The scope must include an
12 assessment not only of capacity to produce projected
13 quantities, but also an assessment of the
14 flexibility to produce a wide variety of
15 radioisotopes whose initial quantity may be small.
16 As the treatments become more refined, therapeutic
17 doses will require that more energy from the
18 radiation be deposited on the target cells – cancer
19 cells, thereby requiring higher and higher specific
20 activity radioisotopes. The neutron resources must
21 therefore be able to produce sufficient quantities
22 of high specific activity radioisotopes. Backup
23 resource capabilities during shutdown periods of
24 the neutron resources must also be provided to
25 assure reliability.

1 Recommendation three: The scope of
2 the PEIS must include an assessment of the entire
3 infrastructure necessary to meet the significant
4 growth rates of medical isotopes over the next
5 thirty-five years. This infrastructure must also
6 include a reliable supply of radioisotopes available
7 to researchers and clinicians in small quantities at
8 affordable prices, so that needed early-stage
9 research and clinical trial work can proceed in a
10 way that can lead to widespread treatment
11 procedures.

12 Finally, I'd really like to get
13 together with the Walla Walla professor. My
14 daughter went to Whitman. And I think one of the
15 things – and I think this is the emphasis – let's
16 get together, review these things that's part of the
17 EIS process, and quantitatively determine the needs,
18 not make any predecisions. Let's do the
19 calculations, do the quantities, and get together,
20 both groups. Thank you.

21 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

22 Yes, go ahead.

23 STATEMENT OF CINDY MEYER

24 MS. CINDY MEYER: My name is Cindy
25 Meyer, and I'm from Walla Walla, Washington. And

1 I'm really loud tonight.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Here. Take this
3 microphone. Yeah.

4 MS. CINDY MEYER: I would like to see
5 the United States government focus our funds,
6 intellect, creativity, and effort on cleaning up
7 Hanford, the most contaminated site on the
8 continent. I think we need to remain especially
9 vigilant in these areas regarding the start-up of
10 the Fast Flux Test Facility. We are an agriculture-
11 dependent community, and it is imperative we not
12 pollute our crops through the water or the air.

13 Hanford is currently leaking
14 radioactive waste. Since we already own the most
15 polluted site in America, we must not produce any
16 more waste, nor should we accept any nuclear waste
17 from any other source. We should not divert even
18 one dollar from the important mission of cleanup.

19 Restart of the FFTF violates the
20 commitment the Department of Energy made to shut
21 down the FFTF when they signed the Tri-Party
22 Agreement. The National Institute of Medicine has
23 deemed that the FFTF is inappropriate for medical
24 isotope production and calls market demand for these
25 products speculative at best. If demand grew,

1 smaller more modern accelerators could produce a
2 wider range of isotopes at lower cost without the
3 safety and nuclear waste problems produced by the
4 Hanford FFTF reactor.

5 And most importantly, I feel, is that
6 I'm a mother, and my most biggest concern is for my
7 children, and for everyone's children. And I think
8 it's imperative that we get together, we concentrate
9 on cleaning up, we don't import any more waste, and
10 we, first and foremost, do no more harm.

11 Thank you.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

13 Sir, I'd appreciate it if you would
14 come up here. In the brown. Yeah. After that.

15 STATEMENT OF ROBERT FRANCO

16 BENTON/FRANKLIN COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

17 MR. ROBERT FRANCO: Thank you. I am
18 Robert Franco. I'm an M.D., retired surgeon. The
19 Benton/Franklin County Medical Society, which is an
20 organization of all the licensed physicians in the
21 two counties, Benton and Franklin County, last April
22 formulated a resolution, unanimous -- by unanimous
23 vote favoring the restart of FFTF. A copy of the
24 resolution has been mailed to Secretary --
25 Richardson; thank you -- and another copy is on file

1 in the Medical Society office, Kennewick,
2 Washington, 99336.

3 Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

5 The lady here, and then –

6 STATEMENT OF SUSAN BABILON

7 MS. SUSAN BABILON: My name is Susan
8 Babilon. I'm from Walla Walla, Washington.

9 I think it's absolutely imperative
10 that the PEIS include data on how much waste these
11 various options totaled would result in – and that
12 is all missions together, not considered – only
13 considered individually; where and how these wastes
14 will be stored or disposed of; how much waste
15 will enter the environment directly; the quantity
16 and type of radioactive materials that will be
17 transported -- that is, added to Hanford from
18 outside the area, including the routes these
19 transportations will take, also where and how these
20 materials that are brought into the area will be
21 stored and disposed of; how these projects will
22 affect the current and future Hanford cleanup
23 missions of the legacy waste; the risk to the public
24 from construction, operation, especially from
25 generated waste and potential accidents, including

1 those caused by human error, malfunction of
2 facilities, and natural disasters such as seismic
3 activity, and from transportation of radioactive
4 materials and accident scenarios. Also consider the
5 hazards to the environment, especially to local
6 groundwater, to the Columbia River, and to the
7 agriculture in the area, from normal operations,
8 storage of waste, as well as potential accidents.

9 I feel confident that if this
10 information is considered, the risks to the area
11 will be considered too great.

12 I think it's unconscionable to start
13 any productive mission at Hanford, since such
14 missions would add waste to this heavily
15 contaminated area when we're faced with a lack of
16 commitment and a lack of resources to adequately
17 address cleanup, and when we, the residents of the
18 area, have been promised by the Tri-Party Agreement
19 that cleanup would be the future mission of Hanford
20 and not restart with its additional contamination.
21 I'd like to see an alternative that examines the
22 environmental impact of no restart, no hot standby.

23 It's been stated that the DOE – in
24 the article of intent, that the DOE concluded FFTF
25 will not be restarted for plutonium-238 alone, that

1 the mission will only be considered if there are
2 other missions at Hanford. We know there's no need
3 for other missions at Hanford. Medical experts have
4 said that more modern accelerators could produce a
5 wider range of isotopes at a lower cost without the
6 safety and nuclear waste problems that the FFTF
7 would pose.

8 I think – I think the truth is that
9 the DOE is fishing for projects for the FFTF. If
10 we're looking for jobs, cleanup will provide more
11 than enough employment opportunities for the
12 residents of the area, and will more importantly
13 provide a responsible solution and a responsible and
14 admirable legacy for Hanford and future citizens.

15 Recently there was a speaker in Walla
16 Walla discussing the possibility of restart of FFTF,
17 and two Whitman College students stood up and were
18 horrified that he would be spreading such lies.
19 Their father worked – well, fathers both worked at
20 Hanford, they said, and they'd been promised by them
21 that there was only cleanup going on here. I think
22 if you're to enter a mission – if you were to enter
23 a mission here, it needs to be one that we wouldn't
24 be ashamed of to tell our children about.

25 Thank you.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Do you have a copy
2 of your —

3 MS. SUSAN BABILON: Yes.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

5 The gentleman — I've picked another
6 interesting shirt there, so go ahead.

7 STATEMENT OF NORM BUSKE

8 NUCLEAR WEAPONS-FREE AMERICA

9 MR. NORM BUSKE: Okay. Variety is
10 important. My name is Norm Buske. I represent
11 Nuclear Weapons-Free America, which sort of tells
12 you where I'm going with this.

13 The basic bottom line, of course, is
14 that I don't believe it is appropriate to use a bomb
15 plant to make medical isotopes. If we want medical
16 isotopes, let's use a factory that would produce
17 those rather than bombs.

18 Let me tell you how I get there.
19 I've been — basically, at the GAP conference on
20 Hanford in Portland a year ago, the public expressed
21 strong concern for the river and for the salmon, and
22 so I undertook to take a look at what the impacts of
23 Hanford were — or are, rather, on the salmon. Now,
24 I've been doing that by sampling mulberry leaves
25 along the shore. And we went public with some of

1 the strontium-90 results earlier in the year, and
2 then last week we went public with thorium springs,
3 which are downstream of F-Reactor.

4 And what that did is, uncovered
5 basically a large process at Hanford using
6 thorium-232 to produce in reactors uranium-233,
7 which is fissile material. And that generally was
8 not known, nor made public. And as I understand it,
9 the fuels and materials involved are in the
10 thousands of tons range. So this whole waste stream
11 going through Hanford, or this production stream,
12 and generally it was unknown, entirely unknown.

13 Some of you may live in Richland, you
14 know, and maybe some of you even drink the water.
15 The quality of that water is assured, as you know,
16 by a downstream sampler, and they measure their
17 radionuclides and many of the chemicals in it. If
18 you take a look at the data through 1998, which is
19 the current report, you'll notice that thorium-232
20 and uranium-233, the materials that are in this
21 large waste stream at Hanford, are omitted. So next
22 time you have a drink of water, just remember it
23 isn't quite quality assured.

24 The point on that is that one has to
25 be a little careful with the Department of Energy on

1 watching, you know, that everything that they do is
2 tied down real tightly. And one of the concerns, of
3 course, is that FFTF was not supposed to be
4 restarted, and now we see that there is these
5 missions. This bomb plant is to come up to produce
6 medical isotopes, which, we agree we need the
7 medical isotopes, by why a bomb plant?

8 I raised the question, of course, if,
9 you know, is it bomb a plant or is it not? And of
10 course it says here what missions are not included,
11 but as you could tell from my question, what I
12 understand is that we suspect that a separate NEPA
13 review might be required to go into special nuclear
14 materials production for bombs. In other words, DOE
15 really is not required to do that. And what it
16 looks like from my standpoint is, it's a bomb plant.
17 And what I ask that be included in the EIS is – is
18 that which is not precluded; that is, that the bomb
19 missions be run through it not as missions, but as a
20 client after – client projects after the reactor is
21 restarted. Some of that would have to be classified
22 and could not be published, but you can march
23 through it, and in the outcome you can have the
24 environmental impacts of the weapons; that is, if
25 you produce weapons, they'll be used.

1 The U.S. basically is the standard
2 setter in the world today as far as proliferation
3 and other matters. If we go into what are these
4 very special materials, super-fissile materials, the
5 things that you can really only produce well with
6 FFTF, those things are going to be used, and then
7 they'll be used on us. What I suggested in Seattle
8 was that they consider the Seattle Center as an
9 exemplary impact site; that is, that a range of
10 devices would be set off in Seattle Center. I
11 propose for the EIS that we include the Tower Inn as
12 an impact site, so we have two epicenters for the
13 targets.

14 Thank you very much.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

16 Yes, sir.

17 STATEMENT OF ROBERT BEACH

18 MR. ROBERT BEACH: My name is Robert
19 Beach, and I'm a resident of Kennewick. I do work
20 at FFTF, so you might think that I'm prejudiced, but
21 I think you'll find my letter rather not that way.

22 First, I regret these hearings
23 in the Northwest have been disrupted by the voice
24 and actions of a misguided emotional minority. We
25 should not allow this to cloud our view of the

1 reason that we're here. The reason for this study
2 is not whether or not to restart FFTF. The study
3 should address the question of the need to produce
4 isotopes in the United States for medical and other
5 commercial uses, such as food irradiation. This is
6 a much more important national issue than whether
7 one reactor continues to operate or not.

8 Last year, I chided the DOE for
9 having too many splintered projects with no overall
10 guidance as to where the country should go. For
11 example, the plutonium burn project, the Pu-238
12 project, isotope production projects of various
13 types, all of these could have been combined quite
14 economically in the operation of the FFTF, but each
15 project wanted to run independently at what, to
16 them, was the lowest cost for them alone. There was
17 no evidence of a coordinated plan that looked at the
18 lowest cost to the American public. The proposed
19 EIS appears at least to be an attempt to start that
20 effort.

21 The present administration has
22 operated with the evident intent of complete
23 elimination of the nuclear industry in the United
24 States. They've done everything possible to meet
25 this end with nonproliferation as their professed

1 goal. It now appears evident that these words on
2 nonproliferation are just that. There is no real
3 connection. This was just a way to remove the use
4 of the valuable resources of nuclear energy to suit
5 political means.

6 Before this EIS can be completed, the
7 DOE must decide whether the U.S. government is going
8 to support programs promoting the health and welfare
9 of the general public. This is critical, since the
10 DOE has consistently disregarded the needs of the
11 public in meeting the cries of the political minds.
12 If there were three fully loaded 747s crashing every
13 day, there would be urgent action within the
14 government. This is not the case when one looks at
15 the number of cancer deaths, the resulting medical
16 needs of the public, and the exciting possibilities
17 that exist to meet these needs.

18 If the DOE cannot take this bold step
19 forward, then perhaps the legislature needs to step
20 in and dictate actions to be taken. We just need to
21 get out of the endless political morass that we are
22 in, and honestly face up to the fact that the public
23 needs the government to produce something for them.
24 I had cancer in my family, too.

1 Cost of this project is not really a
2 question, not when there exists the possibility to
3 greatly improve the health and welfare of the
4 general public. If this EIS is well done; it should
5 bring this need out into the open.

6 The EIS should clearly state, first,
7 that the United States government fully intends to
8 take all steps necessary to develop and fully
9 utilize the use of radioisotopes in medicine and in
10 other civilian applications such as the elimination
11 of e-coli through food irradiation.

12 Two, an unbiased evaluation of the
13 future requirements for medical isotopes and other
14 commercially used isotopes should be made. This
15 would be independent of the production source.

16 Three, an unbiased evaluation of the
17 capabilities of the present DOE facilities to meet
18 these needs, along with meeting all their other
19 present needs, must be made.

20 Fourth, an unbiased evaluation of the
21 future lifetimes for these existing and rather aged
22 DOE facilities should be made.

23 Fifth, an unbiased evaluation of the
24 environmental impacts resulting from the various

1 methods of production should be made. As a side
2 note, it's strange that the completion of an EIS on
3 the environmental impacts of FFTF operation is
4 necessary at all, since the plant has been evaluated
5 and operated for tens of years with minimal or no
6 impact.

7 Sixth, a conclusion as to whether any
8 of these proposed alternatives make sense should be
9 made. Actual economics are important, but that's
10 not the sole governing force.

11 In conclusion, DOE has long stated
12 that they want to leave a lasting positive legacy in
13 the Pacific Northwest. A center dedicated to the
14 production of isotopes, including not just the FFTF,
15 but the other facilities necessary to produce
16 medical isotopes and distribute them, would be such
17 a legacy. A man of vision could see that further
18 development into a national research facility to
19 support nuclear technology would be –

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

21 MR. ROBERT BEACH: – something that
22 we're presently allowing to languish.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

24 MR. ROBERT BEACH: Thank you.

25 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank

1 you. We can get the guy in the brown.

2 STATEMENT OF DAVE WATROUS

3 COLUMBIA BASIN CHAPTER

4 AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR METALS INTERNATIONAL

5 MR. DAVE WATROUS: I'm Dave Watrous,
6 representing the American Society for Metals, local
7 chapter, a group of 40,000 of us in the U.S. I have
8 been a nuclear materials engineer for forty-three
9 years at this point, half of the career spent here
10 at Hanford.

11 And our organization is in support of
12 the FFTF and EIS.

13 (Facilitator adjusting microphone.)

14 Oh, that's good. Okay.

15 The Fast Flux Test Facility has drawn
16 considerable criticism from anti-nuclear activists
17 regarding nuclear waste generation. And you've
18 heard this from Gerry Pollet and others this
19 evening. Many distortions of fact and outright lies
20 have been stated as excuses to not restart the FFTF.
21 An example is a flier that I saw from the Tides
22 Center in San Francisco that claims that significant
23 levels of cesium-137 and cobalt-60 in the Columbia
24 River are equated to releases from the FFTF, whereas
25 absolutely no radiological releases were ever made

1 to the Columbia River from FFTF.

2 Actual facts are that FFTF will
3 generate extremely low levels of nuclear waste
4 during production of plutonium-238, medical and
5 industrial isotopes, as well as supporting various
6 research and development missions, as you've heard
7 tonight. Thus, this proposal for a least-waste-case
8 scenario for the operation of FFTF.

9 In order for the FFTF to be
10 productive, we need reactor fuels, control rods, and
11 targets in order to make various products. And
12 we've got to make them, and use them, and get rid of
13 them. If operated at 100 megawatts thermal, FFTF
14 will operate about six years on the current supply
15 of fuel we have. If we then use the German fuel
16 from SNR-300 that has been offered to us in 1991,
17 where I was a participant and the coordinator of the
18 meeting here in, actually, Pasco, we would have
19 another fourteen years of supply of fuel, and \$30
20 million to the Treasury, or whatever you want to
21 modify the fuel, which is to take the fuel and turn
22 it upside down inside of a new fuel assembly which
23 would be made in the U.S. Other options would have
24 to then come on board after the twenty-year mark,
25 and there are various ways of doing that, including

1 using INEEL to do so because they are in the process
2 of getting ready to do a MOX fuel. And so with that
3 in mind, we wouldn't produce any waste in our part
4 of the territory. Control rods produce no waste.
5 They start off as nonradioactive boron carbide. No
6 problem. Neptunium targets, on the other hand, are
7 very much highly radioactive. They would probably
8 be made at Savannah River because that's where it is
9 now. And I would hope that they would continue
10 making the targets because that's where most of the
11 work was done.

12 Operation of the FFTF itself produces
13 significant radioactive products inside the core –
14 no question there – but near zero releases to the
15 environment. During operation from '82 to '93, the
16 FFTF released no radiation to the soil and extremely
17 minimal tritium releases to the atmosphere,
18 primarily from the international tests for the
19 fusion first-wall work for breeder materials
20 development. During 1992, as Pam Brown was saying,
21 the plant emitted a total dose equivalent to the
22 public of less than one-ten-thousandth of a rem –
23 millirem; excuse me – approximately one
24 three-millionth of that naturally occurring here in
25 the Tri-Cities. The reactor and coolant systems, due

1 to the nature of the sodium coolant, are closed,
2 sealed systems, and release nothing.

3 No high-level waste will be produced
4 during operation which is to then be placed in
5 Hanford waste tanks. Let me repeat that because
6 this has been a subject that has come up several
7 times. No high-level waste will be produced during
8 operation that will be placed in the Hanford waste
9 tanks. None.

10 Ten years of operation of the FFTF
11 has produced 11 metric tons of spent fuel.
12 Operation at 100 megawatts for the next thirty-five
13 years would produce another 16 metric tons. This
14 contrasts with over 2,100 metric tons in K-Basins at
15 this point, which are then to be transferred to the
16 canister storage building. The total space that we
17 are now using on a pad at FFTF is such that with the
18 rest of this fuel, it would occupy less than a
19 football field. Where would you put it? Interim
20 disposition would be in the canister storage
21 building in the 200-Area. That's at least one
22 option.

23 The solid dangerous waste products
24 from the plant will consist of rags, and comparable
25 materials totaling about four cubic meters per year.

1 A dump truck. The material would be shipped to a
2 RCRA facility for treatment, storage, and disposal,
3 by law. Solid mixed waste would total less than a
4 half a cubic meter per year. Low-level liquid waste
5 is expected to total 1,000 to 1,500 gallons per
6 year, which could be transported to the 200-Area
7 Effluent Treatment Facility for processing and
8 ultimate disposal of the resulting noncontaminated
9 effluent in the state-approved land disposal site
10 north of the 200-West Area. Nonradioactive liquid
11 waste would be treated at Energy Northwest, and
12 solids would be transferred to Richland, if they can
13 ever get the contract signed again, or other
14 contracted sites.

15 Activities subsequent to reactor
16 operation would produce no waste at Hanford,
17 including the plutonium-238 separations, which would
18 be done elsewhere.

19 Processing of medical isotopes will
20 produce amounts of radioactive waste at Hanford, one
21 of the options being the 325 building at Hanford.
22 There are other options on other sites. The
23 fifty-foot open test assemblies used for medical
24 isotopes would also contain – that contained the
25 materials that produced the isotopes would be

1 disposed of as high-level solid waste totaling two
2 assemblies per year. They -- and there are already
3 several MOTAs that have been -- that have gone
4 through the process.

5 In summary, FFTF operations at
6 Hanford have been very successful, and have produced
7 minimal radioactive waste. A least-waste-case
8 scenario -- which I have trouble pronouncing in a
9 row -- would continue to produce negligible amounts
10 of waste at Hanford. Absolutely no high-level
11 liquid waste would be added to the Hanford tanks.
12 The total increase of waste volume at Hanford would
13 be expected to be far less than a hundredth to a
14 tenth of one percent of that already present.

15 That ends my basic remarks. I have
16 three minor comments -- two minor comments. I'll
17 skip the third one.

18 In our local newspaper, an opponent
19 has stated that there's a 30 percent probability of
20 public harm if -- during operation of FFTF. This --
21 if you look at the reports that have come out, this
22 is not true. Therefore, what I would like to
23 propose is a new, more likely measure of harm to
24 Seattle from the operation of FFTF. It would be 1
25 divided by a googol. In case you don't know what a
26 googol is,

1 it's ten to the hundredth power. So that's the harm
2 that's likely in Seattle, if I can use that term.

3 The other one is, they compared FFTF
4 to Monica Lewinsky. And in this case I would
5 suggest we change the metaphor somewhat. Change it
6 to somebody positive, such as Elizabeth Dole. And
7 you've heard about her very recently, like
8 yesterday. She has had a series of ups and downs in
9 her career, mostly ups, and she has a bright future,
10 if you look behind the scenes at what's going down;
11 particularly, if money becomes available. And
12 that's what FFTF needs.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
14 have a copy of your comments, sir? Thank you.

15 I selected the gentleman over there
16 in the brown jacket, and then moving over to the
17 other side, I'm going to the guy at the very back
18 who's been standing all evening. I feel sorry for
19 him. Okay? So you can come up after that.

20 Go ahead.

21 STATEMENT OF EDWARD SICILIANO

22 MR. EDWARD SICILIANO: First of all,
23 let me introduce myself. My name is Edward
24 Siciliano, a nice Irish boy from Brooklyn. And I've
25 been here in Richland — I live here in Richland,

1 I've been here for nine years. I came from an
2 academic background and doing teaching at two major
3 universities as a professor of physics for a few
4 years. And I know Ernie, so give him – say – tell
5 Moniz that Siciliano says "Hi." We worked in a
6 similar field – the nuclear and particle physics.
7 I've consulted throughout the world. I've lived in
8 many states, and basically I'm settling down here.
9 I choose to settle down here. The quality of life
10 is high.

11 I'm not a red-blooded technoid that's
12 for progress for all sake. In fact, I was looking
13 through the issues that I helped shut down while I
14 was in Santa Fe, and that includes a mass burn
15 incinerator, the solid waste dumping areas. There
16 were over 200 in New Mexico when I was there last,
17 before I came here. There were over 200 unregulated
18 landfills, and I helped take part in making 30
19 regional landfills. And finally, there was this
20 pumice mine business going up in northern New
21 Mexico, and this fellow who was our representative
22 for northern New Mexico – his name was Richardson
23 – worked with me, and we helped shut that place
24 down in terms of revamping the 1817 Mining Act. You
25 may be familiar with that.

1 So I'm just saying this because I
2 believe that the onus is on technical people to not
3 necessarily beat the nontechnical people over the
4 head with facts, but to try to communicate because
5 fear is a very real thing. I've seen it. Yet
6 radiation is a very natural thing; I see that. And
7 I'm certainly willing to call a spade a spade, and
8 just get your facts straight, but I think the
9 responsibility is to communicate.

10 Now, since my background was
11 primarily in education before I decided to take the
12 challenge and do something about waste, and come up
13 here and do something about waste, I have to give
14 you my interpretation of "EIS." And I read it
15 "educational impact statement." Let me tell you why
16 I say educational impact statement. Because if you
17 are at all concerned about bridging the future to
18 the nuclear option for energy generation – I'm not
19 talking about this generation; I'm talking about
20 next generation – you realize that some of the
21 reactors that are small reactors at universities –
22 and believe me, I've sat across the hall from these
23 things; they can operate safely – they're used for
24 training graduate students.

25 Now, as in the nuclear and particle

1 world, when we needed larger energies we had to go
2 through fewer accelerators, and so universities had
3 to give up their own individual machines. But the
4 way that was carried out was through this thing
5 called "user facilities." And so what happens was
6 there were one or two designated user facilities
7 that acted as the collaboration vehicle for the --
8 for home professors and the home students to design
9 experiments, propose experiments in front of a
10 program advisory committee, get approved, come and
11 stay a while, do their experiments. It gave you
12 both a win from the educational part, and a win from
13 the facility part.

14 Again, every facility has a finite
15 lifetime, but I think that there's a very
16 interesting and opportune time here to view FFTF as
17 a potential user facility in the Northwest. So I'm
18 making an educational impact statement in which I
19 strongly support FFTF to not only produce isotopes
20 as a bridge until we get a real isotope machine,
21 but to be a user facility for the Northwest for
22 nuclear engineering.

23 Thank you.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

25 I selected the guy standing in the

1 back. Do you have some slides you need to -- I'll
2 put them on, put them up for you.

3 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Yeah.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

5 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay, yeah. My
6 name's Dave Johnson, and I'm a board member of Heart
7 of America Northwest. And a lot of guys probably
8 know me from this room, 'cause I worked at Hanford
9 for many years. In fact, I worked for Bob Schenter
10 for a number of years.

11 And this is a viewgraph of the FMIT
12 facility which was designed here between 1977 and
13 1984, on the top. Now, nobody can see all the
14 details on there, but what I'm trying to say is,
15 this thing was designed and ready for construction
16 in 1984 when the fusion budget ran out.

17 And let me go to the second
18 viewgraph, and I'll show you a little bit more.
19 Okay. And -- no, bring it down a little bit.

20 On the upper left corner is a view, a
21 close view, of the target, which is liquid lithium.
22 And the beam comes in from the right. Well, this is
23 an accelerator-based neutron source facility. And
24 it's a beam of deuterons, 35 MEV, hits liquid
25 lithium target, stops in there. Some fraction of

1 the deuterons break up in there, and the
2 neutrons keep going in the former direction. And
3 that orange thing over there is kind of the balloon
4 that represents a large volume of the neutron flux
5 there, which is comparable to that found in the
6 FFTF.

7 So what I'm here to pitch is for the
8 environmental impact statement to take a look at
9 this concept for an accelerator-based neutron
10 facility to -- as a competition for the FFTF
11 reactor.

12 And some of the reasons that I think
13 it would be better are, first, cost. Look at cost.
14 Now, I -- the FFTF proposal says that it would take
15 \$229 million to restart the FFTF. Based upon the
16 FMIT data, upgraded a little bit, I estimate it
17 would be less than \$200 million, from scratch, to
18 restart such an accelerator-based neutron source
19 facility.

20 Then there's operating cost, the
21 second item. I think that the PEIS should take a
22 look at that in this accelerator concept. FFTF
23 proposal says it would cost \$55 million a year to
24 operate the FFTF. Based upon the FMIT data, I
25 estimated it would cost \$10 million a year to

1 operate this accelerator.

2 Third one is cost recovery. The FFTF
3 proposal says during the first few years of
4 operation of the FFTF, medical isotopes would bring
5 in about \$10 million a year. Well, the operating
6 costs of this accelerator is about \$10 million a
7 year, so it matches. On the other hand, the FFTF
8 doesn't match it. There's a shortfall for the first
9 year or so of \$24 million, and it takes a while for
10 the medical isotope business to grow, if it's
11 accurate, such that eventually it will match the
12 expenses of the FFTF; whereas, you know, if the
13 number of costs – or, the revenue brought in by
14 medical isotopes is accurate in the FFTF proposal,
15 this accelerator could start generating a profit,
16 you know, shortly after operation.

17 Now, a fourth item is that you can
18 produce all the medical isotopes, the
19 neutron-induced isotopes, with this kind of an
20 accelerator, but you can also use the beam itself.
21 The beam, when irradiating various targets, will
22 generate a number of medical isotopes that can't be
23 produced in the FFTF. So you have the opportunity
24 for making more isotopes, including the short-lived
25 positron emitters that can't be produced in FFTF, so

1 you'd have a local source.

2 Now then, there are other things like
3 -- what is it? Safety, you know. Now, I'm not
4 saying that the FFTF is the worst reactor that was
5 ever built, but you know, there's certainly concern.
6 That's why we have control rods, that's why there's
7 concern about uncontrolled chain reaction, you know,
8 release of sodium. That's why there's a containment
9 vessel. There's no similar issues here with an
10 accelerator. No need for a containment vessel.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

12 MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Then finally, the
13 radioactive waste. You know, there would be some
14 radioactivity here, however there would be no
15 fission products, and no transuranics which
16 eventually have to be, you know, disposed of
17 somewhere. The FFTF, sometime, will have to dispose
18 of those fission products and transuranics that are
19 generated in it. I used to work on the FFTF.

20 Anyway, I think that the PEIS should
21 consider this as an alternative, and they should
22 also consider Los Alamos National Lab to evaluate
23 this proposal.

24 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Do you
25 want those back? There you go.

1 And actually he came all the way from
2 the other side, so I'd picked this lady right here
3 to come up from this side a bit ago. Thanks. Go
4 ahead.

5 STATEMENT OF RHEAN SOUDERS

6 MS. RHEAN SOUDERS: I'm Rhean
7 Souders. I'm from Walla Walla, and -

8 THE REPORTER: Could you say the name
9 slowly, please?

10 MS. RHEAN SOUDERS: Rhean, R-h-e-a-n,
11 Souders, S-o-u-d-e-r-s.

12 When we see our friends and family
13 dying and suffering from cancer and other diseases,
14 it's really hard not to feel a sense of urgency that
15 we need to do something about this now, we need to
16 save the people we care about and at least save them
17 some suffering if we can't save their lives. But I
18 think this is very shortsighted. We need to look
19 at the long term and to talk about preventing cancer
20 before it starts. The mission at FFTF, these
21 medical isotopes, do nothing to prevent cancer.
22 It's not going to keep anybody from getting sick.
23 All it's going to do is help some people who are
24 already sick. But what is it going to do down the
25 road?

26 A gentleman earlier talked about

1 three 747s crashing every day, and it seems to me
2 that this analogy really is like saying, well, let's
3 take our aviation safety dollars and let's put them
4 into figuring out how to make parachutes for people
5 when the planes are going down, or let's figure out
6 how to bring people back to life after they've hit
7 the ground, rather than making the planes safer,
8 finding ways to prevent these crashes before they
9 happen.

10 We've already got groundwater
11 contamination happening. It's already in there.
12 It's – it's not like, well, we're not sure, it
13 might happen. It's there, and it's going to get
14 worse. There's going to be more contamination in
15 the water as these tanks continue to leak. This is
16 completely unacceptable. If there's any addition to
17 the waste stream from Hanford it's going to make
18 this issue worse, even if it's just a little bit.
19 If you have a glass that's already overflowing, if
20 you add a single drop to it, it's going to overflow
21 more. And this is unacceptable.

22 We have other options to make these
23 medical isotopes. Of course, we want the isotopes.
24 We want to help people, in addition to preventing
25 more cancers. But we have other options, as has

1 been discussed here by people who know the physics
2 better than I do, who know the economics better than
3 I do. We need to look into those before we start
4 talking about adding to the waste stream at Hanford.
5 The only mission at Hanford should be what the DOE
6 has promised, that it will be cleanup, only cleanup,
7 and no more production. Thanks.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

9 The gentleman here in the -- yes.
10 Sure. Then coming back over here, we will get you
11 in the blue.

12 STATEMENT OF GEORGE RUGE

13 MR. GEORGE RUGE: My name is George
14 Ruge, and I'm from Richland, Washington. I have
15 three points that I'd like to make.

16 The first point is, I'd like to
17 applaud the decision for proceeding with this
18 programmatic environmental impact statement. I
19 think such a plan for an infrastructure
20 requirements necessary to satisfy future irradiation
21 services is long overdue. I think the PEIS process
22 will form the basis for solidifying a strategic plan
23 for the effective utilization of existing
24 facilities, and I personally feel it's exciting to
25 think about developing a stable domestic supply for

1 plutonium-238 and medical purposes.

2 Point number two, I think
3 statistically one out of three of us will develop
4 cancer in our lifetime. I am a cancer survivor for
5 the past twelve years, so I know first-hand that
6 once one is diagnosed, one is grasping for treatment
7 options. The primary treatments for cancer are
8 nearly barbaric, and haven't changed for decades.
9 They consist of surgery, cutting out the tumor and
10 the surrounding tissue; chemotherapy, which is
11 basically a shotgun approach for treating the entire
12 body using a variety of engineered poisons; and
13 external beam therapy, which treats both – treats
14 and damages both the tumor and the surrounding
15 tissues. My personal treatment involved two rounds
16 of the former and the later.

17 I don't know if internal medical use
18 of isotopes or smart bullets would have been
19 effective against my liposarcoma, but I would have
20 liked the additional noninvasive option available
21 back in 1987. I know my mother, who is a survivor
22 of both kidney and bladder cancer, feels similarly.
23 I pray that a more effective and humane treatment
24 options will be available as my two young daughters
25 grow up.

1 My third and final point is, I feel
2 that I am qualified to discuss the potential uses of
3 FFTF and FMEF. I spent ten years with the
4 engineering staff at FFTF in start-up and
5 operations. I spent thirteen years with the
6 engineering staff starting up and operating FMEF. I
7 know the quality of these facilities, their staffs
8 and their untapped potential. Their capabilities
9 complement each other very well. Use of these
10 combined resources eliminates many of the
11 transportation issues presented by the other
12 options.

13 Finally, I feel that the utilization
14 of these two facilities would be effective use of
15 DOE resources and would result in a win/win
16 situation for the public; that is, resulting in
17 desirable products at a least cost.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

19 STATEMENT OF SOL GUTTENBERG

20 MR. SOL GUTTENBERG: Good evening.
21 I'm Sol Guttenberg, the Engineering Manager for the
22 Fast Flux Test Facility, and I have been associated
23 with the plant since 1971. As such, I believe that
24 I am especially qualified to speak to the factual,
25 technical attributes of the FFTF and the proposed
26 missions.

1 Let's start off with technical
2 excellence. The FFTF is the most unique and
3 versatile test reactor in the world. It is the only
4 DOE reactor built to commercial light water reactor
5 standards. The design criteria were extremely
6 conservative, and as a result the plant is very
7 robust. Its start-up phase and ten years of power
8 operations were exemplary, and are attested to by
9 the numerous awards that the facility has received.
10 This standard of excellence is also reflected in the
11 plant staff. Their professionalism and experience
12 provide a benchmark for maintaining staff
13 excellence. I am proud to be associated with this
14 team.

15 Moving on to reactor safety, the
16 plant has an enviable record even among commercial
17 light water reactors. Building on sound technical
18 principles, the plant safety systems reflect both
19 diversity and redundancy. In fact, as a result of
20 its unique features, preliminary studies conducted
21 several years ago indicated that the probability of
22 occurrence of a severe accident at the FFTF was
23 approximately 100 times less than a typical
24 commercial light water reactor. It is our intent to
25 finalize these studies if FFTF were directed to
26 restart.

1 From a radiological perspective, FFTF
2 releases no radioactivity to liquid pathways, and
3 routine releases to the atmosphere are essentially
4 zero. For example, in 1990, a typical year of power
5 operation, the maximum exposure to an off-site
6 individual was 0.00056 millirem. This is
7 approximately a half a million times less than the
8 dose that each of us receives from natural
9 background sources of radiation. My expectation is
10 that this minute exposure would be comparable for
11 the proposed missions as well. I can go on, but the
12 message is clear. The FFTF is a safe reactor.
13 Statements to the contrary either reflect a lack of
14 technical competence, or are a deliberate distortion
15 of the facts to pursue a private agenda.

16 Another topic of interest is waste
17 generation. FFTF operation, as with all industrial
18 activities, will generate some wastes. The
19 quantities of waste generated by the FFTF missions
20 are expected to be very small and comparable to
21 types and quantities of waste that were generated
22 during previous operation of the plant. These
23 wastes would be safely managed in full compliance
24 with state and Federal laws, as they are now. The

1 existing Hanford site waste management facilities
2 can readily accommodate this small incremental waste
3 with essentially no impact to the Hanford site
4 cleanup schedules. For example, it is estimated
5 that if all the liquid low-level radioactive waste
6 expected to be generated by the FFTF missions over a
7 projected thirty-five-year life could be processed
8 in the 300-Area Effluent Treatment Facility in less
9 than two days. Thirty-five years in less than two
10 days. Similar comparisons demonstrating low impacts
11 can be made for all the projected waste streams. In
12 fact, the projected or expected quantities of waste
13 are typically within the error bands of the Hanford
14 site waste forecasts themselves. Of course, the
15 PEIS will formally address waste stream quantities
16 and impacts for each alternative under
17 consideration. The main point here is that the
18 waste streams are very small, can be readily
19 accommodated, and pose no threat to the public or
20 the environment.

21 With respect to the proposed
22 missions, the size and versatility of the FFTF is a
23 plus. I am sure that others will speak to or
24 provide written comments on the need for medical
25 isotopes in the battle against cancer, providing a

1 reliable source for Pu-238 and enhancing nuclear
2 research within the United States, and therefore I
3 will not address these further. And as a matter of
4 fact, that has been done tonight. Let it suffice
5 that I am confident that FFTF can safely and
6 effectively accommodate these multiple missions. In
7 fact, comparable activities have already been
8 performed at the plant; for example, isotope
9 production, target irradiation, international
10 collaborative endeavors, special fuel and materials
11 testing, et cetera, were successfully conducted
12 while maintaining excellence of operation and
13 safety. FFTF did it before, and FFTF can do it
14 again.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

16 MR. SOL GUTTENBERG: Thank you.

17 STATEMENT OF GAI OGLESBEE

18 MS. GAI OGLESBEE: Hello. I'm Gai
19 Oglesby. You saw me here before. And my ancestors
20 and I have lived in this country since the 1940s, so
21 we've heard a lot about Hanford from the start to
22 now. This whole issue has to do with much research,
23 and who you trust, and what you trust. For those
24 who are ill in this audience, I wish you well, and
25 you must decide what is best for you. My family and
26 I are doing what we believe we have to do. The site

1 cannot be cleaned up. Only cleanup projects can be
2 implemented and improved. And I think anybody that
3 works at Hanford knows that. The U.S. DOE is not
4 going to take care of anyone yet.

5 I have a little thing here that I'm
6 going to read as far as I can, till my time runs
7 out, about radioactive munitions, depleted uranium
8 contaminants in the U.S.

9 "When the Pentagon radically revised
10 its tally of deaths from friendly fire during the
11 summer, it did so after testing vehicles damaged and
12 destroyed during the Gulf War from radiation.
13 Depleted uranium shells left a telltale radioactive
14 residue in the ruins of the military vehicles they
15 hit. Since the U.S. and British are the only
16 militaries to use depleted uranium in their
17 anti-tank munitions, the Pentagon was forced to
18 concede that at least 35 of the 148 U.S. soldiers
19 killed in battle during the Operation Desert Storm
20 were victims of fire by their fellow soldiers.
21 Seventy-two of the 467 GIs wounded also fell victim
22 to friendly fire.

23 "A secret report by the United
24 Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, AEA, said at least
25 forty tons of depleted uranium or DU were left

1 behind by allied armies. The report calculates that
2 there is enough uranium in Kuwait and southern Iraq
3 to cause 500,000 potential deaths. The report,
4 prepared in April, was revealed in November by
5 *Independent* – by an independent British newspaper.
6 About 5,000 rounds of DU were fired by U.S. tanks,
7 and many tens of thousands by U.S. aircraft.
8 British tanks fired a small number, said the AEA
9 report.

10 "DU dangers. The danger comes not
11 only from a direct attack by DU shells. The uranium
12 particles spread by the war pose a long-term health
13 threat in and around the battlefield. People in the
14 Gulf War region who lived for months under the cloud
15 of smoke from oil well fires face a longer-term
16 additional airborne hazard from uranium particles.
17 My son-in-law was on the front lines, 101st
18 Airborne, and he's getting worse from his illnesses.
19 We're not very happy about that, 'cause the
20 government's not helping him.

21 "The AEA, while saying that
22 half-million potential deaths was an obviously not
23 realistic theoretical figure, added that the volume
24 of uranium in the desert does indicate a significant
25 problem. Depleted uranium is the by-product of the

1 uranium enrichment process for nuclear weapons
2 production and nuclear reactors. These industries
3 use uranium-235. During enrichment, the percentage
4 of U-235, a more radioactive and less stable form of
5 uranium, is raised leaving large amounts of the
6 less radioactive U-238 which predominates in
7 natural uranium as waste. DU consists of 99.8
8 percent U-238 which decays slowly, emitting
9 primarily alpha radiation."

10 These - I'll just go on.

11 "In a deadly form of recycling, the
12 DU is molded into the armor-penetrating shells fired
13 by M-1 A1 tanks, A-10 attack planes, and Apache
14 helicopters. Navy warships use DU shells in their
15 anti-aircraft guns. DU is also used to harden the
16 armor of tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles.
17 Ironically, in the Gulf War only DU shells pierced
18 M-1 tanks' DU-hardened armor.

19 "DU is especially dangerous when
20 inhaled, or enters the body through a wound or by
21 swallowing. While U-238's alpha radiation does not
22 travel far - a piece of paper or the skin can stop
23 it - it can cause a great deal of damage once in
24 the body, where it can cause cancer and genetic
25 defects. Unlike an X-ray, which provides" -

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

2 MS. GAI OGLESBEE: — "a brief

3 exposure" —

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

5 MS. GAI OGLESBEE: Okay. I want to

6 state —

7 "Contamination at home. In the U.S.
8 groundwater contamination has been found near a test
9 site in Minnesota. In Socorro, New Mexico, at
10 another test site, U-238 has contaminated a pond
11 used to irrigate a golf course."

12 There's a whole bunch of these
13 contaminated areas from U-238.

14 "If New York State authorities were
15 concerned about the release each month of radiation
16 equivalent to the particles from one or two uranium
17 projectiles, why isn't the U.S. government concerned
18 about the effects of tens of thousands of
19 projectiles being fired in a few days at war?"

20 THE FACILITATOR: It's five minutes.

21 MS. GAI OGLESBEE: Okay. Thank you.

22 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
23 have a copy of the — yeah.

24 MS. GAI OGLESBEE: I'll turn it in to
25 this lady right here.

1 STATEMENT OF ERIN GAJARSZKI

2 MS. ERIN GAJARSZKI: Hi. I'm Erin
3 Gajarszki, and I'm with Heart of America Northwest,
4 but I'm here today representing myself. I'm here
5 today representing the food chain, many of the
6 animals that roam around the Columbia River and use
7 that as a resource, as a habitat, as food, that roam
8 around the Hanford Reservation. I represent those
9 that can't be here tonight, hundreds of citizens
10 that couldn't be here tonight for various reasons.

11 Before any missions are considered
12 which lead to the restart of FFTF, the Hanford
13 Nuclear Reservation must be cleaned up to the
14 fullest extent possible. Sixty-eight of the 177
15 tanks are leaking through the groundwater towards
16 the Columbia River. This has serious implications,
17 not only on the public health, but the ecological
18 integrity of the Columbia River, including salmon
19 spawning, including the deer and the other critters
20 which feed on the vegetation that reach the
21 groundwater that is contaminated.

22 My point is, is that FFTF restart
23 will only add more waste to the leaking tanks at
24 Hanford. Yes, these tanks are leaking, but yes,
25 over \$100 million has been diverted from our cleanup

1 funds into the hot standby of FFTF. The Tri-Parties
2 have not met the commitments of cleaning up these
3 tanks which is outlined under the Hanford cleanup
4 agreement.

5 Under the scope of the EIS I would
6 like to see the impact that the waste created at
7 FFTF will have on these tanks. These tanks are
8 corroding right now, as we speak. These tanks are
9 at risk of explosion. And as the woman mentioned
10 earlier, one drop more to these tanks could have
11 serious, serious implications on public health and
12 the river.

13 Also, regarding the production of
14 plutonium-238, I know you say that NASA will
15 purchase this plutonium-238 at Hanford. I've been
16 told that NASA's actually cutting out the use of
17 plutonium-238, so under the scope of this agreement
18 I want to know where that binding contract is that
19 that NASA's going to purchase this material from
20 FFTF. I want to know that they're going to purchase
21 it. I want to see that promise.

22 And that's it. Thank you.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Back -- I'm going
24 to go back to this side. Comments from over here?
25 No? Well, did you change -- okay. There's a

1 gentleman right here in the green jacket.

2 STATEMENT OF WALT APLEY

3 MR. WALT APLEY: My name is Walt
4 Apley, and I live in Richland, Washington.

5 All things being equal, I believe
6 that the potential future needs for research and
7 irradiation services warrant designing and building
8 a new state-of-the-art reactor to provide a
9 steady state source of neutrons. But I also believe
10 that PEIS Alternative 4, which is building that new
11 reactor, is not a viable option because the billions
12 of dollars in funding would never be approved, given
13 other national priorities; and even if it could be
14 approved, it would take an entire generation for the
15 authorizations, reviews, construction, testing, and
16 placement in operation.

17 Given that building a new reactor is
18 not a viable option, the Department should make
19 their decision based on considering which existing
20 facility is the safest, most reliable, represents
21 the most modern technology, has the best operating
22 record, and most fully supports the known and
23 possible needs. I personally believe that the FFTF
24 is that reactor, and I also believe with all my
25 heart that if FFTF was located in Idaho, or South

1 Carolina, or New Mexico, or Tennessee, it would be
2 successfully operating today.

3 Finally, this August, Secretary
4 Richardson made the decision to begin the NEPA
5 process for the FFTF based on the nineteen to two
6 recommendation of the Department's Nuclear Energy
7 Research Advisory Committee. Yet, paradoxically,
8 DOE has not requested sufficient funds to maintain
9 the FFTF in FY2000 pending either shutdown or
10 restart. That shortfall must be corrected to make
11 this PEIS process honest and fair. I'd ask that the
12 DOE representatives here today take that message
13 with them back to Washington, D.C.

14 Thank you.

15 THE FACILITATOR: Did you have a copy
16 of yours you want to give us?

17 MR. WALT APLEY: No.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

19 STATEMENT OF BRUCE KLOS

20 MR. BRUCE KLOS: My name is Bruce
21 Klos. I'm representing myself, and I'm from
22 Kennewick, Washington.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Can you get closer
24 to the microphone?

25 MR. BRUCE KLOS: Okay. My name is

1 Bruce Klos. That's K-l-o-s. I'm from Kennewick,
2 Washington.

3 THE FACILITATOR: We're going to go
4 back up to this mike. You've got a soft voice.

5 MR. BRUCE KLOS: I have a soft voice.
6 Okay.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Let's try it again.

8 MR. BRUCE KLOS: Okay. I'm a soft
9 kind of guy. Okay? Okay, thank you.

10 I request that in addition to those
11 mission areas and alternatives identified in the
12 Notice of Intent that the Department include as part
13 of the cost analyses an estimate of the savings to
14 the Medicare program that would realized by the use
15 of medical isotopes. Advances in medicine have
16 extended the lives of most Americans, and in fact,
17 it is estimated that the population of the elderly,
18 those who rely on Medicare for treatment will
19 double from almost 40 million today to 80 million in
20 thirty years.

21 In America, the average incidence of
22 cardiovascular disease is one in two; for cancer,
23 one in three. For the elderly, these odds are even
24 higher. Given this data, it should not be a
25 surprise that Medicare costs are going to increase,

1 increase substantially. The solution to this very
2 real problem will require one or more of the
3 following:

4 Increased taxes to cover increased
5 costs; decrease the amount that Medicare will cover
6 and pass those costs on to the elderly; support
7 initiatives that reduce the cost of treatment.

8 Based on a cost comparison of
9 conventional treatment and that associated with the
10 use of medical isotopes, medical-isotope-related
11 treatment is typically one-half of the conventional
12 treatment. Therefore, Federal support for the
13 expansion of medical isotopes will not only save
14 lives and significantly improve the quality of life,
15 it will significantly reduce the cost of treatment
16 and substantially reduce the future cost to
17 Medicare.

18 Preliminary conservative estimates
19 place these savings in avoided treatment costs with
20 the medical isotopes at more than \$600 billion over
21 the next thirty years. These are hardly savings to
22 be ignored. However, for these savings to be
23 realized, the Federal government must fund the

1 research that advances the science of medical
2 isotope use; must assure that an adequate supply of
3 research quantities of medical isotopes is available
4 to support the research; and lastly, assure that
5 production facilities are available to meet expected
6 demand.

7 I have one final note that I wanted
8 to make. There was a comment that was made earlier
9 by a representative from the Heart of America
10 stating that the program scoping plan misrepresented
11 the deactivation costs. And I believe the source of
12 his comment was a document that was submitted, the
13 field work proposal, in April, that identified those
14 costs. That document, by form, identifies the cost
15 for three years. And true, those three years of
16 cost total about 150 million.

17 However, that document also very
18 clearly identifies that the deactivation period is
19 six years, so the representative from the Heart of
20 America must not have understood, or must have
21 thought that the next three years were for free, if
22 he assumed that the total cost was 150 million. I
23 guess I would offer the comment that either the
24 individual is illiterate, incompetent, or a liar,
25 and I'll leave that up to the audience to determine.

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Let's not
2 head down that road here this evening.

3 I want to get the guy here with the
4 slide. He told me about it earlier, and I want to
5 make sure I get it before our equipment goes away.

6 Okay. Just tell me when to turn it
7 on. Okay. Thank you.

8 STATEMENT OF JAMES PAGLIERI

9 MR. JAMES PAGLIERI: Jim Paglieri,
10 engineer, Richland. I have thirty-five years of
11 experience in the nuclear industry, about half of it
12 at FFTF. I'll follow my written comments, but some
13 details and the justification for some statements
14 will not be given in my oral presentation because of
15 time.

16 DOE should be commended for their
17 decision to write an EIS and evaluate the facts on
18 this extremely important national issue of the
19 FFTF's future. FFTF's fate is an extremely
20 important issue for a number of reasons, including
21 the 104 billion annual cost of cancer in the U.S.,
22 and the statistic that's been mentioned that three
23 out of four families will be affected by cancer.

1 In addition to the items mentioned in
2 the NOI, the No Action Alternative and Alternative
3 2, to use existing facilities, should address in
4 detail the impacts to research and development. For
5 example, FFTF is virtually the only reactor in the
6 world that can carry out important nuclear waste
7 conversion experiments.

8 In addition to taking into account
9 the future increased demand for medical isotopes as
10 described in the expert panel report, the increased
11 growth in isotope usage in nonmedical applications
12 such as agriculture, insect/disease control, and so
13 on, should be further researched and factored into
14 the studies/PEIS.

15 Ready for the viewgraph.

16 The viewgraph is taken from the
17 expert panel's report on estimated isotope
18 production and sales. And as you can see, it goes
19 from roughly 100 million to 1.1 billion in twenty
20 years. The EIS study is for thirty-five years, so
21 it would be extended.

22 The period that's covered needs to be
23 extended, as I mentioned. In order to give an
24 appreciation for the estimated growth in isotope
25 production, the curve from the expert panel should
26 be included in the PEIS, replotted on the ordinary

1 linear graph paper as I have done. However — and I

1 don't have this in my written comments -- that
2 without adequate isotope production, this graph and
3 the benefits will not take place.

4 Thank you for the viewgraph.

5 U.S. capability to produce most of
6 our isotope needs should be a goal. Also, isotopes
7 that currently are only needed in research
8 quantities should be provided. The isotopes that
9 only FFTF can make in commercial quantities and with
10 adequate specific activity should be factored into
11 the PEIS evaluations.

12 DOE's proposal in the NOI to
13 reestablish a reliable domestic supply of Pu-238 is
14 very prudent considering the uncertainty of Russian
15 supplies and potential for low quality. However,
16 the Pu-238 production objective of 5 kilograms per
17 year should be increased to allow for more frequent
18 and extensive missions, as well as allowing for
19 manned missions. For example, the Planetary Society
20 advocates much-expanded space exploration such as
21 for mining minerals and so on. Hampering space
22 exploration during the thirty-five year period to be
23 covered by the PEIS due to inadequate Pu-238 supply
24 would be very unwise.

25 The option of using a commercial

1 light water reactor to produce Pu-238 should take
2 into account delays due to a number of adverse
3 factors such as legal challenges and licensing, and
4 whether any utility would be interested in doing it.

5 There are a number of negative
6 factors that should be included in the evaluation of
7 Alternative 4, construct new research reactor, such
8 as the extreme difficulty in obtaining both initial
9 and continuing funding for a very large project.

10 An Alternative 5 should be added:
11 Restart FFTF, utilize existing operational
12 facilities, and construct a new accelerator. Based
13 on the expert panel's estimate of future medical
14 isotope production extended to thirty-five years,
15 and other needs, the use of FFTF in conjunction with
16 existing operational facilities, and a new, possibly
17 small, accelerator may be necessary or desirable.
18 Also, an accelerator and FFTF would complement each
19 other on the range and efficiency of making some
20 isotopes and would assure continuous isotope supply
21 during facility outages.

22 The factor "Environmental Justice"
23 that is listed in the NOI should be retained. Some
24 environmental justice considerations include – and
25 I'll just mention one – the availability of medical

1 isotope treatments for lower income populations if
2 the No Action or Alternative that would result in
3 FFTF termination are chosen.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Five minutes.

5 MR. JAMES PAGLIERI: In my opinion,
6 Alternative 1, to restart FFTF, will be clearly
7 shown to be the preferred alternative and have the
8 greatest benefits of any of the choices.

9 Thank you.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
11 want this to be put in the record? Thank you.

12 We're now at the 10:30 hour. We've
13 been at it a few hours, and I want to keep -- I'd
14 like to see a show of hands of how many people have
15 been so patient with me they still want to comment.
16 I see one hand, two, three, and four, five. Okay.
17 So we'll start over here with the -- yes, sir.

18 And then -- I'm sorry, you said --
19 did you -- yeah. Then you, here. Okay.

20 STATEMENT OF MICHAEL CONTINI

21 MR. MICHAEL CONTINI: Good evening.
22 My name is Michael Contini. I am a resident of
23 Franklin County. I'm an electrical engineer
24 employed at FFTF.

25 I will -- I would like to thank the

1 Department of Energy for having a scoping meeting in
2 the Tri-Cities. We, the residents of Benton and
3 Franklin Counties, are the most immediate
4 downstreamers or downwinders from Hanford and the
5 FFTF.

6 In 1983, I was a cancer patient. It
7 goes without saying that my family has a lot at
8 stake here. I favor the alternative which makes use
9 of the FFTF because it can safely supply the most
10 diverse number and quantity of medical isotopes.

11 The programmatic environmental impact
12 statement must include the following, and I'm
13 probably alone in saying this one: a complete and
14 categorical lifetime exclusion of any future mission
15 for FFTF involving the production of any weapons
16 materials such as plutonium or tritium. That means
17 if DOD wants some, they can get it somewhere else.

18 A complete identification of all
19 medical, industrial, and space mission isotopes, and
20 the quantities, grams per year, which are to be
21 produced in the first five or ten years of
22 operation.

23 Included shall be a complete analysis
24 of the radiological and chemical waste products and
25 streams generated from the production of the target

1 material, to the isolation and final preparation of
2 each isotope. This must also include the waste
3 products associated with the operation of the FFTF
4 core. Estimates of waste quantities must be
5 considered as kilograms or liters of waste product
6 per gram of the associated isotope, ready to be
7 transported.

8 Under the alternatives, which do not
9 include the use of FFTF, the PEIS must also include
10 the above. In addition, it must contrast the
11 production capability of each isotope being
12 considered. In the case of the medical isotopes, it
13 must assess the impacts of limited production or
14 availability to the treatment and lives of cancer
15 patients.

16 For all alternatives, a section must
17 be included which identifies the plans and
18 activities which will be put into place to minimize
19 isotope production waste and reactor core waste,
20 therefore minimizing the impact to the environment.

21 A commitment must be made, if a
22 particular alternative is chosen, to include the
23 detailed plans and programs in the authorization
24 basis.

25 For the alternative including FFTF, I

1 suggest that a criterion for authorization must be
2 the creation of a waste board. The charter of this
3 board would be to research and supervise the
4 implementation of methods to minimize final
5 quantities of waste to be stored. Those would
6 include process improvements, recycling, and finding
7 external uses for the waste products.

8 This PEIS must include and address
9 the concerns of all, and I truly mean this – even
10 Gerry Pollet's concerns. Okay? Those that I have
11 heard can be lumped into categories of safety,
12 waste, and need. The DOE must not dismiss any
13 scoping recommendations made by any individual.

14 In conclusion, the PEIS must present
15 an overall picture of the benefits and limitations
16 of each alternative and the cost of each to the
17 environment. Humans are part of the environment;
18 therefore, it is right and just to consider the
19 impacts of medical isotope supply limitations to the
20 humans with cancer.

21 Some contend that this is a regional
22 issue. Wrong. Cancer is a national and
23 international issue, with the availability of
24 treatments being a supply and demand issue.
25 Remember, in a limited supply environment, those who

1 can pay -- foreign dictators, social elite,
2 political elite, Hollywood elite, the rich -- get
3 the treatments. The rest of us will be left with
4 surgery, chemotherapy, beam radiation treatments,
5 and the well-known consequences of them.

6 Thank you.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

8 Yes.

9 STATEMENT OF WAYNE BAKER

10 SIEMENS POWER CORPORATION

11 MR. WAYNE BAKER: My name is Wayne
12 Baker. I have a statement on behalf of Siemens
13 Power Corporation.

14 For those of you who may not be
15 familiar with our company, I will tell you that we
16 manufacture fuel assemblies for commercial nuclear
17 power plants, primarily located in the United States
18 and the Far East. We employ about 730 people here
19 in Richland.

20 Since we are a nuclear company, I
21 will say from the outset that we have no vested
22 corporate interest in the Fast Flux Test Facility.
23 We are not a Hanford contractor, and it is unlikely
24 that we would ever supply fuel or services to the
25 FFTF. As the old saying goes, we have no dog in

1 this fight. However, as an interested third party
2 and a corporate citizen of the Tri-Cities, we would
3 like to express our opinion.

4 This evening and in other public
5 meetings we have heard time and again a broad range
6 of opinions from those with vested interests in the
7 outcome, to those who oppose anything and everything
8 involving the word "nuclear," regardless of what it
9 is or where it is.

10 In the midst of this rhetoric, we
11 encourage you to pay the most attention to the
12 voices of those, often silent, who are the real
13 benefactors of nuclear isotope technology. I speak
14 of those who have been, and hopefully will be,
15 helped in their fight against cancer and other
16 diseases. To them, this is not just another lengthy
17 public meeting because they are involved in a
18 life-and-death struggle. On a personal note, I will
19 say that my father was one of them; for him it is
20 too late. But hopefully, it will not be too late
21 for others like him.

22 We believe it is abundantly clear
23 that both medical and industrial applications of
24 nuclear technology offer potential worthy of
25 exploration. It would indeed be a shame if the

1 United States does not develop these technologies to
2 their fullest potential. And we believe that the
3 FFTF can play a significant role in these important
4 research missions.

5 I have submitted for the record a
6 letter from another Siemens affiliate, namely
7 Siemens Medical Systems Corporation, which expresses
8 their views on the potential of the FFTF for medical
9 isotope production.

10 Thank you.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Is that one -- is
12 that different? Okay. Thank you.

13 Yes, sir.

14 STATEMENT OF TOM BURKE

15 MR. TOM BURKE: My name is Tom Burke.
16 I'm a resident of Kennewick, Washington. I'm here
17 tonight representing myself, but maybe taking the
18 lead from the young lady from the Heart of America,
19 I can say that I think I'm really here representing
20 thousands of my closest friends and relatives.

21 I would like to make just two
22 comments related to the scope of the Nuclear
23 Infrastructure PEIS.

24 The first comment is, I really
25 question why the construction of the new reactor and

1 new accelerator should be addressed beyond a brief
2 assessment of their capabilities.

3 We know that the Federal budget, and
4 in particular the Department of Energy budget, is
5 very limited, even to the point where there is a
6 question whether the FFTF can be maintained in an
7 adequate standby condition. If we can't afford to
8 maintain FFTF or restart FFTF, then we certainly
9 can't afford to build a new multi-billion dollar
10 facility. Even if we could, why would we want to,
11 if FFTF can accomplish those missions for a small
12 fraction of the cost? A detailed evaluation of
13 these new facilities is likely to increase the cost
14 of the PEIS substantially. I believe that the funds
15 from those studies should, instead, be used to
16 maintain the FFTF.

17 I, therefore, recommend that the new
18 reactor and the new accelerator options be
19 eliminated from further consideration.

20 My second comment is related to the
21 proposed 100-megawatt operating power level. I
22 believe that this power level was selected pretty
23 arbitrarily, primarily on the basis of extending the
24 fuel supply for the FFTF. However, I think that
25 this is very shortsighted. I believe that the PEIS

1 should consider and allow for the possibility that
2 the FFTF could be operated at a higher power level,
3 up to and including its rated power of 400
4 megawatts.

5 The primary function of the reactor
6 is to produce neutrons for material irradiation.
7 The rate of neutron production is basically
8 proportional to the power level. And if neutrons
9 are needed to be produced at a higher rate, then we
10 should do it, even if that means we use up the fuel
11 supply at a more rapid rate. I think we should
12 point out that the cost of generating a neutron at
13 low power is substantially higher than it is
14 generating a neutron at high power.

15 Furthermore, there may be some
16 missions, either nuclear research missions or
17 increased irradiation missions for which the
18 higher power operation would be highly desirable or
19 maybe even required. The extensive safety analyses
20 and the outstanding safety record of the facility
21 fully support operation at up to 400 megawatts, and
22 the PEIS should allow this, even if it's only for
23 very limited periods of time.

24 Finally, although I know it's not the
25 function of this meeting, I would really like to

1 voice my support for the restart of FFTF. It's an
2 outstanding facility with tremendous capabilities
3 and a near-perfect operating history. To throw away
4 such a valuable resource at a time when the existing
5 national and international nuclear capabilities are
6 insufficient to meet current and future needs is
7 absolutely insane, and is an inexcusable waste of
8 taxpayer money.

9 Thank you.

10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Did you
11 have a copy of your statement that you'd like to
12 give us?

13 MR. TOM BURKE: I will mail it in.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thanks.

15 We have how many more commenters?

16 Two - one, two, three - four people.

17 I'm coming to you, of course. Oh,
18 yeah. You were thinking you didn't want to play the
19 lottery, did you? Yeah, okay.

20 STATEMENT OF BILL MARTIN

21 TRI-CITY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

22 MR. BILL MARTIN: My name is Bill
23 Martin, M-a-r-t-I-n. I'm here tonight representing
24 the Tri-City Industrial Development Council, also
25 known as TRIDEC, T-R-I-D-E-C. Our council consists

1 of over 350 members involved in business, labor,
2 agriculture, the cities of Pasco, Richland, West
3 Richland, and Kennewick, Benton and Franklin
4 Counties, our three local port districts, and other
5 professional organizations. We have been designated
6 by the Department of Energy as the one voice
7 speaking on behalf of the community.

8 TRIDEC strongly supports a PEIS for
9 civilian nuclear energy research and development and
10 medical isotope missions at the FFTF. The PEIS has
11 been nationally accepted as the method to determine
12 the feasibility of a program. TRIDEC supported
13 siting the FFTF at Hanford in the mid-1960s. We
14 have never regretted bringing this one-of-a-kind
15 facility to Hanford.

16 In over ten years of operation, the
17 FFTF never experienced an accident or incident that
18 injured any worker. It was designed, engineered,
19 and built to strict standards, and it established an
20 outstanding performance record unmatched by any test
21 reactor under DOE ownership. In short, we support
22 the FFTF and this unbiased PEIS process.

23 I want to thank you for the
24 opportunity to appear this evening. We've already
25 submitted our written comments to your office.

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

3 I'll go all the way over here. I saw
4 a -- yes, ma'am, come on up. Thank you.

5 STATEMENT OF SHERYL I. PAGLIERI

6 MS. SHERYL PAGLIERI: I'm Sheryl I.
7 Paglieri, housewife.

8 Thank you for the decision to prepare
9 an environmental impact statement, EIS, that will
10 address the Fast Flux Test Facility's future, and
11 for holding a hearing in Richland to listen to the
12 concerns of both proponents and opponents of the
13 restart.

14 Like many people, we have lost both
15 relatives and neighbors to cancer. Also, we have
16 some relatives and friends that are currently
17 suffering from cancer. In one week, three people we
18 heard about. The lifetime risk of cancer is one out
19 of two for men and one out of three for women.
20 Every thirty seconds, an American gets cancer.

21 There are a number of medical
22 isotopes that show great promise in treating cancer
23 and other diseases. However, without FFTF, many of
24 the isotopes and some treatments will not be
25 available.

1 Living in the vicinity of FFTF in
2 Richland is not a personal concern. The facility
3 has an extremely good safety record, and according
4 to the experts, there are many design features that
5 will assure safe future operations. Also, the large
6 containment dome assures that even in the extremely
7 unlikely event of an accident, radiation would be
8 contained.

9 Also, considering that there are no
10 radioactive liquid discharges to the ground from
11 FFTF, and the four-and-a-half-mile distance to the
12 Columbia River, drinking water that is taken from
13 the
14 river by the City of Richland is not a personal
15 concern.

16 Hanford waste cleanup and operation
17 of FFTF can be effectively done at the same time.
18 For example, with FFTF in standby, cleanup progress
19 is being made and \$1.1 billion per year is being
20 spent. FFTF is needed to safely carry out
21 multiple missions, including medical isotope
22 production, Pu-238 production, conversion of nuclear
23 waste, testing of proliferation-resistant fuels, and
24 life extension testing for commercial reactors.
25 All of these missions should be fully addressed in
26 the PEIS.

1 Alternative 1, to restart
2 the FFTF, should be identified as the preferred
3 alternative. That is of a great importance to our
4 nation, neighbors, and friends, children and
5 grandchildren.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Do you
7 have a copy? We got the copy, right. Thanks.

8 We got it, Charlotte. Yes.

9 There were a couple of other hands,
10 did I see, for comments? Yes, sir.

11 STATEMENT OF DICK HAMMOND

12 MR. DICK HAMMOND: Thank you. Dick
13 Hammond is the name. I'm an electrical engineer,
14 Masters degree from Washington State.

15 I have a great deal of history in
16 this area, and my opinions have been certified by
17 forty-five years of experience in Richland. I drink
18 the water here, I fish here and eat the fish. I
19 take care of all these risks, and I've been able to
20 handle my future very well.

21 I completed successful treatment last
22 summer in cancer, utilizing the linear accelerator,
23 and I think that's a direct result of the R&D with
24 FFTF, had really wonderful results from this.
25 Cancer is about people, as has been said earlier
26 this evening.

1 Laurel Piippo mentioned a variety of
2 things, and I concur fully with her concerns about
3 cancer. I've had three bone scans, utilized
4 technetium for every one of them, and in every case
5 it came from Canada, even though the half-life was
6 only a few hours, and it was very uncertain whether
7 we would get it. The last time it was three hours
8 late and I had to wait for it.

9 I listened to Bob Schenter and his
10 concerns. I did engineering design and construction
11 with FFTF and FMEF for twenty years, so I know what
12 it means that useful isotopes can be produced, and
13 that it is definitely not a risky business at all.
14 John Boland said that he's boated, swam, and fished
15 in the Columbia River, and so have I. There are
16 benefits to the use of nuclear medicines.

17 FFTF should restart; that's my
18 fundamental position. The monies will all be well
19 spent. A nuclear accelerator would require further
20 development to R&D in order to fund that concern. I
21 don't believe our budget reflects that at all. Only
22 a small part of that would be necessary for FFTF
23 restart.

24 This is not a threat to the Columbia

1 River from any nuclear isotopes, from tritium or any
2 other radioactive element – projections of nuclear,
3 moderate or future, indicates that very clearly.

4 FFTF is an irreplaceable machine.
5 Hanford is not the most radioactive in the U.S., as
6 has been stated tonight, not at all – far from it.

7 I'm a father, in quotation -- well,
8 that's a follow-up to those people who've said
9 they're a mother. I think I have equal interest and
10 concern in my children.

11 I agree with the resolution of Dr.
12 Franco and his respected organization, that FFTF is
13 a likely thing to push.

14 Norm Buske made a very false
15 statement that FFTF is a bomb plant – very, very
16 wrong.

17 There is a need for production of
18 isotopes, and FFTF is the logical place to do it.
19 Negligible risks would be created by FFTF.
20 Radioactivation is a natural fact, as George Ruge
21 has said. I'm qualified in designing FFTF and FMEF;
22 I've been working on that for many years. The
23 transportation risk would be very minimum with FFTF
24 under way.

25 As Sol Guttenberg comments, I am

1 qualified to judge and evaluate the staff of FFTF,
2 and I must agree that they have a very safe
3 operation. Ten years of awards in safe operation so
4 indicates that.

5 Walt Apley indicated the
6 alternative to FFTFs are around, and they are
7 naturally – that is, the radioactivity that comes
8 from FFTF is a natural thing and is nothing to be
9 fully excited about. The FFTF is economical, safe,
10 and reliable.

11 Jim Paglieri, the engineer with
12 thirty-five years here, Hanford FFTF, said FFTF
13 should produce isotopes, and only FFTF can do this.
14 The uncertain Russian supply is there, and the very
15 high cost which is likely. There are several viable
16 – variable alternatives, but all of them are much
17 more expensive than FFTF would be.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

19 MR. DICK HAMMOND: To eliminate funds
20 for the accelerator is an ideal way to save monies
21 for our budget. FFTF is an outstanding facility and
22 a vital machine. It's an inexcusable use of
23 taxpayer money to do else – elsewhere than fund the
24 evolution of FFTF.

25 As with Bob – Bill Martin, who is

1 the TRIDEC voice of the Tri-City community, FFTF has
2 never had any accident or failure to it in its
3 entire history. A good safety record and large
4 containment dome is with FFTF. We should restart
5 it. It's a very preferred alternative.

6 Thank you.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

8 We have people with additional
9 comments, so -- all right, I'm just -- I think you
10 haven't gone yet, have you?

11 MR. ROBERT BURKE: No, I haven't.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Come on up, yeah.

13 No, I'm going to let him go before.

14 Right.

15 STATEMENT OF ROBERT BURKE

16 MR. ROBERT BURKE: Before I begin the
17 comments for the record, I've taken a new job out at
18 the plutonium finishing plant, and I note with some
19 irony that I'm tasked with dealing with 4300 liters
20 of solution that was stopped from being processed by
21 the very people who are opposing the FFTF-type
22 alternatives, and some of those other things that
23 need to be done. But now we're going to end up
24 paying considerably more to resolve those liquids
25 that were not processed out at PFP.

1 My name is Robert Burke, no relation
2 to Tom Burke, although I enjoyed working with him
3 for several years. I live in Kennewick.

4 Tonight we've heard discussions about
5 costs. I daresay that the environmental activist
6 who's outside now trying to prove that he is not
7 incompetent, who tried to use the costs earlier to
8 support his case, fought in the past to ensure that
9 the NEPA process turned a blind eye to operating
10 costs, but rather, focused on environmental costs.
11 I should make clear I'm not suggesting that costs
12 don't matter. In fact, costs, schedule, and
13 technical maturity, combined with the programmatic
14 environmental impact statement, will lead to the
15 Record of Decision.

16 The responsibility of the Department
17 of Energy is clear. That responsibility is mandated
18 by the Federal law in the Atomic Energy Act. That
19 responsibility, unless and until changed by law, is
20 to provide a reliable supply of isotopes and
21 services for medicine, industry, research, and space
22 exploration. That responsibility, in the context of
23 this programmatic environmental impact statement, is
24 a given. The discussion should not be whether or
25 not the Department will provide a reliable supply of

1 isotopes and services. The discussion should be how
2 will the Department produce those isotopes and
3 services.

4 To that end, the PEIS must focus on
5 the environmental impacts of the alternatives, and
6 it must focus on all the environmental impacts. For
7 example, it must include the environmental impact of
8 the new energy sources required to power new
9 isotope-producing facilities.

10 Thank you.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

12 At this point I'd like to know, is
13 there anyone who has not commented – who would like
14 to at this point? Yes, ma'am, go ahead.

15 STATEMENT OF MELODY JENKE

16 MS. MELODY JENKE: Waited all night,
17 right? My name is Melody Jenke. And three years
18 ago I was diagnosed with an incurable non-Hodgkin's
19 lymphoma. I've been through two years of
20 chemotherapies – thank God I haven't lost my hair
21 yet. I've done monoclonal antibodies. And a year
22 ago I was accepted into a treatment program at
23 Virginia Mason to try out the "smart bullets." It
24 was great. Compared to everything else I'd been
25 through, it was a quick injection: wham-bam-thank-

1 you-ma'am – out of there. And two months out, I
2 had 90 percent shrinkage in tumor site. Three
3 months out, I had 100 percent remission. The only
4 downfall is, three months after that I had my cancer
5 back again.

6 So I vote on medical isotope
7 production at FFTF. I'd like it in-house. I'd like
8 it in – on my side of the state. I know that a lot
9 of the isotopes do have short lives, so keep it
10 in-house. Let's do it.

11 Thank you.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Any additional
13 comments from anyone who has not gone yet? And you
14 wanted to have a brief –

15 MS. MARLENE OLIVER: Just real quick.

16 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, real quick,
17 right.

18 FURTHER STATEMENT OF MARLENE OLIVER

19 MS. MARLENE OLIVER: Well, too bad;
20 I'll just leave it there.

21 I just had a real quick comment. I'm
22 not a physicist; I know there have been a lot of
23 technical questions. My background is as a research
24 biologist with twenty years in the medical industry.

1 I'm asking that the DOE please check
2 references when you receive information. I'm just
3 going to use an example, not to disparage anyone.
4 There was a young lady who mentioned the National
5 Institutes of Medicine. I'd never heard of the
6 National Institutes of Medicine. When I went back
7 to ask her personally what the National Institutes
8 of Medicine was, she didn't know. Please keep that
9 in mind when you do your study. Please check your
10 references for validity.

11 Thank you.

12 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Okay,
13 thank you.

14 Any additional comments?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think she was
16 referring to the National Academy of Scientists –
17 Science Institution.

18 MS. MARLENE OLIVER: She didn't say
19 that.

20 THE FACILITATOR: Okay, that's fine.
21 Thank you. Okay, you'll bring me up – thank you.

22 Any additional comments on the scope
23 of the PEIS? Yes, sir.

24 STATEMENT OF DICK OHAVA

25 MR. DICK OHAVA: My name is Dick
26 Ohava.

1 I think something else needs to be
2 considered. The aerospace industry started out with
3 \$20 billion, and the return on the investment has
4 been tremendous. This investment needs to be looked
5 at from that aspect, also. If you make this
6 investment, what is the return?

7 Thank you.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Okay,
9 thank you.

10 Any additional comments at this time?

11 If not, I'd just like to take – beg
12 your indulgence for a second, and thank everybody on
13 the team this week, the Department of Energy, our
14 court reporter, Frank and the crew, and all the
15 people who've worked hard, including the DOE people
16 who have been out here all week to make this a very
17 successful thing. But it was really successful
18 because of what a great, courteous group you were.
19 And thanks a lot.

20 Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, at 10:58 p.m. the meeting was concluded)

C E R T I F I C A T E

We hereby certify that this is the transcript
of the public meeting called by the Department of
Energy concerning its

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

held on Thursday, October 21, 1999, in Richland,
Washington, and that this is a full and correct
transcription of the proceedings.

Karl Fuss, Reporter

William Wagner, Transcriber